







THE

BC

AMERICAN  
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

---

VOLUME XIV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1889.

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
HARDY & MAHONY,  
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,  
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1889,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.



# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. XIV.—JANUARY, 1889.—No. 53.

---

## LAND AND LABOR IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES.

*La Fin d'un Monde*; par Edouard Drumont.

*Les Etats-Unis Contemporains*; par Claudio Jannet. 4th edition.

*La Réforme Sociale*; Bulletin de la Société d'Economie Sociale (January to December, 1888).

IN an admirable discourse delivered last summer before the united societies of Social Economy and *Les Unions de la Paix Sociale*, M. Claudio Jannet summed up all the conclusions which he embodies in the last edition of his great book on the United States. A devoted and practical Catholic, an enlightened student and admirer of our country, M. Jannet is eminently fitted to pronounce on our institutions and our people, on our present social and economical condition, as well as on our future dangers and prospects, a judgment that should commend itself to American statesmen and publicists.

“What is specially characteristic,” he says, “of the situation of the United States is that, while the political situation has improved, the social question, on the contrary, has assumed a degree of intense acuteness greater even, if that be possible, than anything known in this old European world of ours. The inequality of conditions develops itself, step by step, in accordance with the progress of American society. This is a law which all societies obey; it is not in itself an evil; it is a fact which we here record.”

We shall see, in the course of this article, with what a judicial, but still kindly, impartiality this eminent professor of political economy in the Catholic University of Paris points out the evils and dangers arising from the present state of the land and labor question in our Republic, as well as the remedies and safeguards which Providence places within our reach.

As to France—and what is said of France applies in a great measure to all continental Europe,—we may take the information furnished us by another eminent Catholic, a devoted and practical Catholic, who wields his pen and exposes his life with the chivalric fearlessness of the French crusaders of old.

If M. Jannet, in his writings and his private life, might serve as a type of the old time *magistrature* of the best epoch, M. Drumont is no unworthy representative of his Breton forefathers, who fought in Palestine under Louis VII. and Louis IX., or followed George Cadoudal and his heroic *Chouans*. If his terrible pen spares no class, no living names in the cowardly, time-serving, mammon-worshipping, corrupt and corrupting French society of to-day, he only does what the patriotic Swiss Catholic did, what more than one of the old Crusaders had done,—seized a bundle of spears aimed at his fellow-soldiers by the foe, and pressed them into his own devoted breast. He hopes that others, more happy, will rush in after him through the breach thus opened in the enemy's ranks, and help save France from the hosts of Antichrist.

Let us see, first, what the author of *La Fin d'un Monde* has to say about the social question, about land and labor in his own country. We shall then follow M. Jannet in his instructive analysis of our own social condition.

## I.

How often have we heard from the lips of Catholic scholars, and read in works now classical, the statement that the French Revolution of 1789 conferred at least one unquestionable benefit on the French popular masses,—that of creating millions of small landed proprietors, instead of the few thousands of nobles who, before 1789–1793, held the soil of France as their inheritance! This sole benefit we have heard set off, in Ireland, a few years ago, as a compensation for much of the destruction wrought by the revolutionary convulsion in the ancient French monarchy.

The fact is that the National Convention, in confiscating the property of the French landlord class, acted on the same principle on which James I., Charles I. and his unscrupulous minister, Wentworth, and the Long Parliament under the Commonwealth, acted in confiscating every foot of Irish soil and selling it to “adventurers.” Cromwell did for his soldiers what English kings and



parliaments had done before him,—divided the land of the Irish Catholics and Protestant loyalists among them, and drove beyond the Shannon all of the old native owners whom he could not exterminate.

The ancient Irish land-laws, either before St. Patrick or after him, never attributed to or acknowledged in the chiefs who bore the title of kings the right to hold, singly or collectively, the whole soil of the island as their own. This was the claim of the feudal sovereigns, which essentially differed from the proprietary right which obtained in Ireland.

There each tribe or clan held the territory, its patrimonial territory, as its own. The tribal chief, who was elective, as were the higher chieftains or kings, was allotted a certain portion of land for his own use. But of this he only had the *use*, not the ownership. He could no more barter it away, or hand it down as an heirloom to his sons or kinsfolk, than he could any other thing not his own.

Hence the outcry raised, when the first Irish chieftains were induced to make their submission to Henry VIII., and to accept from him the titles of earls or barons, together with the investiture of their lands, which they were thenceforward to hold as fiefs from the sovereign. The people protested that the land was not the chief's to transfer to the king, or to hold from him. It was, they said, and truly said, the property of the whole clan, solely and inalienably.

And this protestation, which even English historians note as just and unanswerable, was again and again renewed, when the new earls and barons, growing weary of their vassalage, revolted, were attainted, and saw their lands escheated, or forfeited to the crown. Their people protested that the rebels might rightly lose their titles or their lives in punishment of their treason to the liege-lord they had chosen; but that the attainder could not reach or affect *the land*, which never belonged to the rebels, and never could be forfeited by those who did not own it.

We have made this statement to show that the ancient land-laws of Ireland essentially differed from those of England, from those of France and of most continental countries, where the feudal system prevailed.

But, without at all entering into the right or wrong of the wholesale confiscation or "nationalization" of land, as decreed by the French Constituent Assembly and its successor, the National Convention, we must here meet, with a peremptory denial, the assertion, so confidently made and so universally believed, that the French Revolution created a large class of small farmer proprie-

tors, who took the place of the former landed aristocracy, dispossessed from 1789 to 1792.

Let us, on this most interesting question, hear what M. Drumont and the authorities he quotes have to say:

"What is most astonishing," he writes, "is to see our middle-class Conservatives (*Conservateurs bourgeois*) shrugging their shoulders, and to hear their indignant outcries, when one presumes to discuss, in their presence, the principle of property, especially when one remembers that this French middle-class (*bourgeoisie*) are now living, in a great measure, on the fruits of the most monstrous, brutal, and bloody appropriation that the world has ever witnessed. These middle-class men, whom the very term of 'nationalization of the soil' throws into a violent fit, forget that such a 'nationalization' has already taken place within the present century. Only, far from turning out to be profitable to the entire nation,—a result which never could have been an excuse for the horrible conditions under which it was effected—this 'nationalization' benefited none but the middle class, a fact which should prevent them from uttering such loud protestations.

"One hundred years have not yet passed by since we have seen applied to the whole of France the very theories which, as formulated by the Anarchists of our day, strike the most indulgent minds as something frightful. . . .

"People have generally accepted, and I have myself believed as Gospel-truth, the formulated assertion, 'the Revolution gave back the land to the peasants.'

"The assertion is an absolute falsehood, and socialistic writers, as well as official economists, at present agree in acknowledging its inaccuracy. 'Letrosne informs us,' says Michelet, 'that when Turgot became minister, the one-fourth of the soil belonged to those who tilled it.' In our day, on the contrary, all statistics go to prove that the small farmers do not own one-eighth of the land cultivated.<sup>1</sup>

"Of 14,000,000 of registered land-properties, 61 per cent., that is 8,600,000, include only a total of 2,574,589 *hectares* (each hectare being over two acres) of taxable soil in a grand total of 49,338,304 hectares, that is, only 5.19 per cent.; whereas, the holdings of large proprietors owning fifty hectares and above, with 122,000 registered titles, comprise nearly 18,000,000 of hectares, or more than 35 per cent. of the national arable territory."

Toubeau, in his *Impôt métrique*, and the journal *La Terre aux Paysans* (Maurice, editor, 1885), furnish us with the following table:

<sup>1</sup> See Chirac, *La Prochaine Révolution*, and *La Revue Socialiste* of February 15th, 1887.



	Hectares.
Lands not owned by those who till them: woods, forests, waste lands, marshes, fallows, grazing lands and pasturages, . . . . .	16,000,000.
Lands tilled on the half-profit system, . . . . .	4,000,000.
Lands tilled by tenant-farmers, . . . . .	12,000,000.
49,000 holdings of more than 100 hectares cultivated by farm-laborers, . . . . .	12,000,000.
Houses, out-buildings, orchards, nurseries, gardens, . . . . .	1,000,000.

"Total, 45,000,000 of hectares to be subtracted from 49,000,000; remainder for small farmer-proprietors, 4,000,000 of hectares.

"The share of this latter class is, therefore, *less than one-ninth*.

"The truth is, as we are told by the authors of *The Land Question*, MM. R. Meyer and G. Ardant, that the French Revolution neither created small proprietors nor destroyed large landed proprietors. It only called forth from another social class men who bought up the old lordships or who built up with their money new and wide domains. To the territorial nobility succeeded the land-owning middle class (*Bourgeoisie*). The former was only invested with the *dominium directum* (the direct ownership, without the use of the soil); the latter enjoys, over and above this, the *dominium utile*. Moreover, the new proprietary class in France have added to the property once held by the ancient nobility a very large portion of the lands and tenements belonging to the Church corporations, and, during the century last past, they have still further increased their property by purchases from small farmers. In the absence of statistics, this fact is made evident by personal observation.

"So, then, the large-landed proprietary class possess more.<sup>1</sup>

"The French Revolution has benefited some people, since, according to M. Fernand Maurice, the Rothschilds now own 200,000 hectares (between 400,000 and 500,000 acres) of the lands of France, more than the nobles did a century ago; and the title on which it

<sup>1</sup> The author of a deeply interesting volume, *La Réforme agraire et la misère en France* ("Land Reform and Poverty in France"), M. Fernand Maurice, refutes, in nearly the same terms, the legend of the lands having been given to the peasants by the Revolution:

"Just as the land existed before 1789, just so do we find it a century thereafter. The petty farmer has kept hold of his cottage and of the garden attached to it; this is the sum total of progress. The other 3,500,000 farm-laborers have not even gained the privilege to have a roof of their own, no matter how wretched. For it must not be forgotten that, alongside the 3,000,400 small proprietors of holdings of less than ten acres (5 *hectares*), who are mostly obliged to work for others, agriculture employs also 3,500,000 laborers, real proletarians these, who have only their stout arms to win bread for their families.

"This explains why the farm-laborers emigrate, why the soil remains uncultivated, and why, from 1831 to 1881, 6,000,000 of persons have forsaken the country for the cities."

is wrongfully held is more absolute and more simple than it had ever been since the Roman period.”<sup>1</sup>

Passing to the use the *bourgeoisie*, or new landlord class in France, made of their power, M. Drumont says that they began by persuading the people, the laboring classes in town and country, that *they*, the people, it was who had done all that was wrong in the Revolution.

“This was just as untrue,” he says, “as was the legend of the land given back to the peasants by the Revolution. The men dressed in fish-women’s clothes, whom Choderlos de Laclos, the agent of the Duke of Orleans, hurled against Versailles in October (1789), the men armed with pikes, . . . the active *sans-culottes* who composed the Terrorist army, never counted more than 2000 or 3000 persons in France; and these were recruited from among men who had lost caste, or who were convicted malefactors, rather than from the ranks of the people.

“Just when the Revolutionists were finally suppressing all corporations, the laboring classes made a formidable protestation against the act. On June 10th, 1790, five thousand shoemakers met in the Champs Elysées; and the carpenters grouped themselves about the Archbishop’s residence. The masons, slaters, and printers assembled at other places in the city. Bailly, Mayor of Paris, who was rightfully guillotined for having shot down the people when he was in power, and who excited the people to rebel when he was out of office, . . . said to the assembled tradesmen: ‘As men, you possess every right, especially that of starving. . . .’ A combination of workingmen to obtain uniform wages, and to compel their fellow-workmen to accept the rate of wages thus fixed, would be a coalition injurious to their own interests. It would be a violation of the law, an upsetting of public order, a serious injury to the general welfare.”

“This,” M. Drumont goes on to say, “is just what those in power to-day in France, the *bourgeoisie* of 1889, are just doing over again.”

After having been mocked by Bailly, the tradesmen petitioned the National Assembly. There all meetings of workingmen and tradesmen are declared to be unconstitutional, inasmuch as corporations have been legally abolished.

A little later the Committee of Public Safety decreed that all workingmen who dared to unite to demand an increase of wages should forthwith be sent before the Revolutionary Tribunal—that is, to the guillotine!

Not till the reign of Napoleon III. were workingmen in France allowed to associate or to strike for higher wages.

<sup>1</sup> *La Fin d'un Monde*, Book I., pp. 3-6.



Furthermore, it is now well ascertained that the people, the true people, both in the cities and in the country-places, were almost unanimously opposed to the Revolution. And M. Drumont quotes, in proof of this, statistics published by that excellent workingmen's journal published in Paris, *La Corporation*, going to show that out of 12,000 persons condemned to death by the guillotine, and whose names and professions are well ascertained—7545 were men of the people—peasants, farm-laborers, workmen, servants.

And it was the popular masses who were sent by the Convention, and afterwards by Bonaparte, to fill the Revolutionary and Imperial armies, and to die on all the battle-fields of Europe.

Not till the old and victimized popular generation had disappeared were the all-powerful *bourgeoisie*, through the public press, able to convince the younger generation that the Revolution was the work of the people. Then the *prolétaires* or non-proprietary classes began to work for the middle-class who now owned the land and gathered the golden harvest, and to secure to them the possession of their ill-gotten power and wealth.

The men who filled the National Convention in the last days of its reign had all cheaply purchased their broad acres and warmly feathered their nests. They decreed that the old custom of confiscating property, as a punishment for enormous crime, should be done away with, as a relic of medieval barbarism!

They thus secured their own estates against all future accidents.

The restored Bourbons sanctioned all that 1793 had done, by refraining from troubling the new possessors. So that the *bourgeoisie*, now completely triumphant, were free to settle their relations with the working classes. *They reorganized labor as they pleased.*

And here comes in what is most vital in the social question in France. The abstract question of the rights of property has long ago been exhaustively discussed in France, both on the side of the Catholic Church and on that of the positivists, socialists, and theorists of every color. So have been the relations between capital and production, between the employer and the workingman. The Catholic Church is no theorist. She sets about binding up and healing the wounds of society, while others are speculating about their origin, their consequences, and their treatment.

In no country in the world—since the Revolution and anti-Christian Freemasonry have taken out of the hands of religion the people and institutions of Italy—has that same religion done more for the workingman and the indigent classes than in the land of France. Nowhere, at this moment, can the statesman and economist behold such admirably organized hosts of men and women, whose best efforts are devoted to the enlightenment of the laboring

classes; to their moral, intellectual, and physical elevation; and to bringing about between capital and labor, between masters and their workmen, that perfect harmony of interests which can only repose on practical brotherly love.

The three published volumes of Count Albert de Mun's discourses leave not one question regarding the wrongs and rights of workingmen untouched. There is not a single practical remedy ever devised by human wisdom, or supernatural charity, for the evils which embitter the hearts and darken the lives of the toilers of earth or its disinherited poor, that the noble director of the workingmen's circles has not most eloquently described and most efficiently applied.

Here in Paris thousands upon thousands of the children of toil, young and old, look up to him with a gratitude and a veneration which are only paid to men who have something God-like about them, and who are felt to be God's instruments for good.

To us it is a wonder how one man, of delicate health too, and with heavy and responsible duties to discharge in his place in Parliament, can find time and strength to multiply his presence all over France, wherever there is need of founding or developing one of these workingmen's circles, and to deliver there a discourse which you could wish to see printed in letters of gold, on tablets as durable as bronze, and hung up there forever.

Catholics in America, friends and helpers of the workingman everywhere, who only know and love Count de Mun for his most eloquent and most successful advocacy of the duties as well as the rights of capital and labor; for his enforcement of the Gospel law of equality, fraternity, and liberty, will be sorry to see any shade cast on so bright and pure a name in M. Drumont's pages.

But there are, besides, among the *bourgeois*, or wealthy middle classes in France, many and many a noble Christian man and woman who make it the pride, the duty, the pleasure of their life to help Count Albert de Mun in promoting all his great works of social charity. We need only mention the two Harmels, father and son, wealthy manufacturers, who are not only benefactors and fathers to their numerous workmen, but who are, moreover, the apostles of that true Christian socialism which the Church preaches, practises, enforces, whenever or wherever she is free to do so.

Again, looking to the Catholic journalists and publicists of France, men who have rendered, during the present century, the most precious services to religion and society, we find that five-sixths of them belong to the middle-class. We have only to name such men as the illustrious brothers, Louis and Eugene Veuillot, together with the staff of men who, for more than fifty years, have been foremost in the front ranks of the battle against Antichrist.



Noblemen and *bourgeois* stand there side by side, forgetting all the differences of birth and social position, and mindful only of the one duty of doing a true yeoman's work in the cause of God and the poor.

The same is to be said of the French Catholic clergy. Its ranks are recruited from every class in society. If the majority are taken from the families of the peasantry and the laboring poor, the wealthy *bourgeoisie* contribute many glorious names to the minority, while, perhaps, the old nobility contribute a still larger contingent.

It is none the less but too true that the Voltairian middle classes are now more than ever, and have been ever since 1830, the controlling force in French politics, French public opinion, and French education. Since the accession of Napoleon III. the Masonic power has drawn into its nets the generations educated in the government schools. By slow but steady degrees the lodges have controlled the administration, the army and navy, the hosts of men and women under the command of the Minister of Public Instruction, and the still more numerous hosts of officials in every department of the public service.

It is, at this moment, notorious that no man or woman has the slightest chance of public employment or advancement, unless such as are affiliated to these openly and avowedly anti-Christian lodges.

It will throw no little light on what we have to say of the land and agricultural movement in the United States, to glance here at what monopolists are doing in France to ruin the latter and depreciate the former.

"The most odious monopoly of all," says M. Drumont,<sup>1</sup> "the monopoly which will end by letting loose on the Jews and their followers the public indignation, is that which is practised on all articles of prime necessity, on the industry and very existence of mankind. . . . The Rothschilds could not help being impelled into such monopolies as this, and thereby to aim at our absolute, complete, total subjugation.

"The *Graineterie Française* (the 'commerce or monopoly of French grains') . . . has covered the market-places of Paris with fresh ruins, after the sad trials already heaped on our growers; the 'combine' has flooded the market with foreign corn, and has thus taken away from our French farmers the small profit they might have derived from a season exceptionally favorable.

"This grain monopoly, exclusively controlled by German Jews, we are informed by *La Gazette des Campagnes*, seeing that, during the month of May (1886), there was, all through Europe, the

---

<sup>1</sup> *La Fin d'un Monde*, pp. 56-58.

prospect of a poor harvest, . . . made an arrangement with the Bank of Nevada, and purchased all the wheat stored up in Chicago, New York, St. Louis, and San Francisco. On June 15th they had thus purchased 37,000,000 of hectolitres of American wheat.

"Thus encouraged, the Jewish speculators bought up that same week all the grain to be found on the markets of Liverpool, London, Hamburg, and Berlin, to the amount of 3,500,000 of hectolitres.

"In less than a week the Jewish combine had raised the price of wheat up to \$10.50, \$11.75, and \$12.00 a sack.

"The trick was played, and the unfortunate purchasers who happened to be uncovered, were obliged to pass through the *Furcæ Caudinæ* of the band.

"Then came fine weather in June; the prices fell, and the 37,000,000 of hectolitres of American wheat were sold for \$2.00, \$2.25, and \$1.80 the hectolitre.

"This edifying narrative (says M. Louis Hervé, quoted by *Le Monde*) gives us some perception of the *Crédit Agricole* as carried on by the Semitic race both in the Old World and in the New. This explains to us the incredible and absurd fluctuations undergone by grain and flour during the last four months.

"Free traders must be very blind if they do not, by this time, know who is to be held accountable for the high price of bread, and that the wheat-grower is the first victim of these cosmopolitan stock-gamblers. . . . At this moment they are laying their Semitic claws on the coal-mining stocks of England, Belgium, France, and Germany, so as to control the sales and dictate their law to all buyers."

M. Drumont here accuses the French Minister of War of playing into the hands of the "Cosmopolitans," and of so ruining French agriculture that in case of a war with Germany, German Jews would alone have the provisioning of both armies. "The protestations of our farmers," he says, "the remonstrances of the Department Councils, petitions addressed to the Government—all is useless. The Minister of War, no matter who he is, knows well that on the very day he would cease to serve the Jewish interest he would be put out of office by the votes of the Freemasons, who are sold to Israel."

These are terrible accusations. But up to the present moment no one has attempted to refute them seriously. The only replies to the author's courageous denunciations of such wholesale treason come from persons who smart under the pitiless lash of the writer.

"What we have said," M. Drumont tells us, further on, "on the syndicate on wheat, is literally applicable to the syndicate on sugar. . . . The Jews began by disturbing the market by their wholesale purchases and their deals. The sugar manufacturers and re-



finers, unable to contend against this formidable combination, were either ruined out and out, or forced to play into the hands of the speculators. Those who thus sided with the Jews have had no reason to complain. For, in the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies of January 15, 1886, M. Sans-Leroy declared that the refiners of Paris received in a single year eight millions of dollars as their share of the fraudulent profits thus realized.

"While these parasites are thus growing rich, the true laborers—the producers—are reduced to extreme poverty. Many farmers have given up cultivating flax, growing wool, wheat, and the white poppy,<sup>1</sup> and concentrate all their industry on raising the beet-root. They have gained nothing by it.

"Never, since the world has existed, have men seen a band of cosmopolitan freebooters displaying such hardihood, upsetting with such light-heartedness all the conditions of existence among peoples; introducing so unblushingly into the peaceful habits of trade gambling, false reports, lying, and thereby brutally ruining thousands of men to enrich themselves. This is the phenomenon of the closing century."

The *bourgeois* class, therefore, who now govern France, have saddled the country with an ever-increasing load of debt out of which there seems to be, in the present paralysis of agriculture and the rapid decline of all manner of national industry, no issue but national bankruptcy; these are the men on whom M. Drumont vents his patriotic wrath. Just as we are writing this, the law-suits instituted, with the authorization of Parliament, against the two Deputies, Daniel Wilson and Numa Gilly, promise to unveil such an extent of official corruption as fully justifies M. Drumont's vehement and frequent denunciations.

Too true is it, then, that the *bourgeoisie* to-day in power are the descendants and the heirs of the men who made the Revolution of 1789, who alone profited by its wholesale confiscations, and who, in 1889, are determined to wrest from their Catholic or monarchical adversaries every remnant of their vested rights, every shred of religious and political liberty.

This is the situation which the civilized world should consider attentively. It has its lessons for the freemen of America, as well as for the subjects of every power in Europe.

The Paris Municipal Council, the great majority of which is made up of men of the class we have been describing, is openly devoted to the realization of the most advanced forms of anti-Christian socialism. Nothing but the merest accident can prevent this powerful body of determined men from proclaiming, at any

---

<sup>1</sup> The salad oil produced by the white poppy (*aïllet*) rivals, among the poor at least, the fruit of the olive.

moment, the supremacy of the Commune. And this example is sure to be followed by Lyons and Marseilles, and other French cities. The present Floquet-Lockroy Ministry are pledged to a revision of the Constitution in an extreme radical sense, to the abolition of the Senate and the Presidency, to the repeal of the Concordat, the suppression of the salaries paid to the clergy, to the sequestration of all Church property, as well as of that belonging to all religious or quasi-religious associations, or even individuals.

On the ruins of the Church and State, of the old Christian order, thus swept out of existence, the men in power will build up, or attempt to build up, a community governed by the principles of advanced socialism, collectivism, and anarchism combined. They will, perhaps, call it a Social-Democratic Republic; but God only knows what it will be.

M. Drumont, who, it seems, is not unwelcome among the anarchistic leaders, thus describes their near expectations: "Once," said they, "that we are put in possession, ourselves, our wives and children, of the palatial residences and beautiful houses of the aristocratic quarters (of Paris), and when we shall have burned down the registry offices, those of the lawyers and notaries, the seat of every public administration—those who should attempt to turn us out must be clever indeed!"

"It is through kindness to me," adds M. Drumont, "that several of these men have assured me that they entertained no special ill-will toward the churches; that they only intended to burn all baptismal registers that could help people to establish their civil standing."<sup>1</sup>

The supremacy of the hitherto oppressed and suffering working classes, without any faith in God or belief in the life to come; without any religion but the worship of their own notions of right, and no law but the gratification of their desires, such is the IDEAL government these madmen contemplate.

Is it, then, wonderful that, in presence of such imminent and fearful changes, all Frenchmen who love the true greatness of their country, who cling to the religion of their forefathers, and would preserve the popular masses from the anti-Christian deluge now sweeping over Europe, should combine and exert themselves heroically to bring the laboring classes and the poor into the Ark of Christian principle, peace and practice?

We should be, therefore, much more anxious to see the Workingmen's Circles founded by Count de Mun and M. Chesnelong, and patronized by such true "Knights of Labor" as the MM. Harmel, Abbé Garnier and Cardinal Langénieux, flourishing and mul-

---

<sup>1</sup> *La Fin d'un Monde*, p. 28.



tiplying their numbers over France, than concerned about the plans proposed for recovering from the International Bank and the Rothschilds the thousands of millions accumulated by criminal and fraudulent speculation.

Until Frenchmen themselves cease to tolerate, to encourage, to participate in these godless schemes for acquiring sudden and enormous wealth at the expense of the public, to the detriment of all lawful industry and of the national honor and credit—it were, apparently, idle to declaim against the foreigners who build up gigantic fortunes on the foibles and follies of the native-born citizen.

We in America are all too familiar with the methods of such greedy and unprincipled speculators. Until the laws of our country, supported by a sound public opinion, shall have stepped in to restrain stock-gambling and to punish the gamblers, we shall continue to have our “Black Friday.” We have also our trusts, our pools, our combines, our monopolies—as they have them in France and the adjacent countries.

All these are the curse of legitimate and honest labor, just as they are the excesses and abuses of the money-power in every State. Nevertheless, in the interest of labor itself, it were better not to call in the interference of the State, unless compelled to do so by the direst extremity.

But in France, as well as in Belgium, the only remedy found for the oppression and suffering produced by the omnipotence of capital, and the greed of great corporations, is to adapt to modern circumstances the systems counseled by religion in the mediæval cities, and which made starvation, pauperism, and a helpless old age things unknown among their guildsmen or trades-unions.

To come to specific and practical measures for benefiting the laboring classes, those, in particular, who are employed in large manufacturing or mining centres, we must be allowed to quote here from *La Réforme Sociale* of October 16th last, passages from a paper read at Lille, in the month of April, before a general assembly of the Catholic Unions of Flanders, Artois, and Picardie. The paper was written and read by M. Guary, Director-General of the Coal Mines of Anzin, who presided in the Assembly at Lille, and is a type of the true Catholic *bourgeoisie*, devoted heart and soul to the work of elevating the thousands of miners and workers under him.

The object of the paper is to show how the “Patronage” of the great Coal-Mining Company of Anzin, established in 1757, is exercised for the protection of all its employees and their families, so as to secure them cheap clothing, provisions, medical assistance, comfortable and healthy lodgings, religious education for the

children, religious instruction for all, and certain provision against infirmity and old age.

In 1865 the company established co-operative stores, under the name of "Co-operative Society of the Coal-Miners of Anzin." They began with a capital of \$5000 divided into \$10 shares. This was employed in purchasing cloths and stuffs, hosiery, etc., together with flour, bread, groceries, lard and bacon. At first butcher's meat was bought and sold out to the men. But they gave it up in summer. All the articles bought are of good quality, and are sold at the current prices in the district, the profits all going to the miners themselves, who are the only shareholders.

The capital invested steadily increased, till it reached \$50,000 in 1888, the number of shareholders being 3,022, about one-half of the employees of the company. Many of the miners live too far away from the stores or shops, of which there are fourteen, to be able to avail themselves of their advantages.

The company at first only gave the ground for the first store, then it gave gratuitously the ground and all the building materials. Now that the society is a great success, it limits itself to carrying free all the merchandise and provisions needed by the stores.

The directors aimed not only to teach the workingmen the rules and practice of domestic economy, but the manner as well of managing the entire business of the co-operative stores themselves. So among the nine members of the Board of Managers, five are workingmen; the others are an ex-agent of the company, an engineer, the superintendent, physician, and a druggist. All these are selected by the shareholders.

The first effect produced by the working of the society was to prevent the miners from getting into debt, and to help them to get out of it. The shareholders are given a fortnight's credit for their purchases. These must be paid for at the end of the second week. No advance is given on unearned salaries. If the last fortnight's accounts are not paid up, no articles are given to the debtor, except for cash paid down, unless he should have sickness or some misfortune in his family, which in the judgment of the board should justify an extension of credit.

The lodging-houses provided for the miners are spacious, healthy, comfortable, well kept, and erected with a view to securing family privacy. Each family pays about \$1 per month for house-rent. Each cottage has also a nice garden-plot.

In the beginning the company generously encouraged their workmen to become the owners of their own cottages; and for this purpose they gave the buildings just for what they had cost, accepting instalments of about \$3 a month in payment of the debt and no interest being asked on the capital expended in the erec-



tion. But, as the French law does not allow parents to leave their property to the oldest or the best-behaved child, these cottages, on the death of the first owners, were sold by the Government at public auction to the highest bidder. And in more than one instance the house thus sold was turned into a tavern. 'Twas a pity; but the company found it wiser to help the cottagers to live comfortably and to lay by their savings for old age.

Since 1833 means have been taken by the company, with the co-operation of the miners, to establish a savings bank for sickness and old age; for widows and orphans. Thereby these thousands of laborers can look forward without anxiety to the time when they can no longer work.

As religion, since the first establishment of this company, has been one of its directing forces, one may expect to see the education of the children and young people also well provided for. They have religious masters for the boys; and the girls' schools are under the charge of Sisters, who also minister to the sick and bring them the prescribed medicines, etc.

To the girls' schools are attached workshops, where the pupils are taught household work, sewing, mending, washing, bleaching, and tailoring. As there is a school for master-miners, the boys, after their first elementary instruction, are sent to this when they give good promise of talent and proficiency.

Every mining village has its church, where the people regularly attend the Sunday services, and are instructed in the Christian doctrine and the duties of Christian life. The children, on making their first communion, receive each a gratuity of 12 francs; and the boys get a complete outfit the first time they are sent down in the mines.

The expenses of public worship, the services of the priest, and those of the physician, are all paid by the company.

M. Guary, from whose paper these details have been taken, has some passages toward the end which should be textually quoted. He is a disciple of Frederic Le Play, and thus speaks of what happened at the meeting of the Society of Social Economy in 1887:

"In his eloquent address at the opening of our annual assembly of 1887, M. George Picot described what he had witnessed at Lille. Let those whose modesty I may alarm by quoting his words—for souls above the common modestly conceal their good deeds—forgive my repeating what he says, since they illustrate the truth I would inculcate. I should have known nothing, says the eminent Academician, 'if I had only followed the material details of the care and solicitude of the president of the company. I learned that not one workman was ever laid up who was not visited in his sickness by the family of some one of his em-

ployers; that not a child fell sick, or a death occurred without having some member of their families to see to the little sufferer, or to comfort the dying in the hour of supreme need. Thus was peace made between master and workman; thus was it maintained. . . .'

"Why," continues M. Guary, "does the magnanimous conduct so touchingly described by M. Picot find so few imitators among us? Why are the poor and the rich so seldom brought together by an intercourse which is the incomparable remedy for curing the wounds of both the one and the other? . . . By such intercourse we could teach the sufferer that the Christian religion, from which people try to turn his heart away, is his sole and best comfort and consolation, as well as the honor and glory of the lowly and the weak.

"We need intermediaries between the workingman and those above him. Since we are all here a single family, the family of Frederic Le Play, allow me to speak out what is in my mind. While glancing over the list of our 'Social Unions,' it seems to me that we have in them an army of officers; but there are neither non-commissioned officers nor soldiers, without whom there is no chance of winning a battle. We must by all means recruit this class of men;<sup>1</sup> and they are to be found among educated young men who have a career before them and a reputation to make. Then they should help to direct and protect the future of artisans and head-workmen, of all that numerous class who, to use the words of M. Picot, 'have many spare hours to dispose of, many idle days on their hands; and who, if they could only be banded together, would soon cast off their drooping spirits, and become joyous and energetic in the new hopes which would give them restored life and strength.'

"How shall we realize our purpose? This is a question to which the leaders of our school of social peace must, in their devotion, find an answer."

Deep as is the need of that social peace in France, we in America begin to feel that the mighty struggle between capital and labor should, among ourselves, be brought to a speedy and peaceful issue.

The past year was stormy and threatening enough in the world of industry. The Church, the Divine Teacher and Peacemaker,

---

<sup>1</sup> These Social Unions, as mentioned in a preceding article, are made up of two distinct but kindred societies, the "Society of Social Economy" and the "Unions of Social Peace," both combining their efforts to carry out the darling object of the illustrious Frederic Le Play—the reform of society in France. The members of both groups are the most distinguished magistrates, jurists, publicists, and economists in Europe; they should, as suggested by M. Guary, call to their assistance all the Catholic educated youth of their country.



has done not a little to still the tempest. It is timely, it is wise, to listen to the men who have again and again crossed this stormy zone, and noted its phenomena. Such a one is M. Claudio Jannet.

## II.

In order to prepare the fourth edition of his now classical work, *Les États Unis Contemporains*, M. Jannet visited our country as well as Canada, observing, noting everything worthy of observation; conversing with the most eminent public men; examining our public establishments of every kind; questioning men of opposite parties and opinions; in one word, taking every means to arrive at a just and enlightened opinion regarding our political and economical condition.

With the former issues of his book the most competent publicists in America, Protestant as well as Catholic, have expressed their great satisfaction. Doubtless, ere this article appears in print, the American press will have pronounced their judgment on the two volumes now before us, and which contain the mature and perfect fruit of the author's conscientious researches.

His conclusions are summed up in a remarkable address delivered on the 29th of last May, before a general meeting of the *Union de la Paix Sociale*, and which we had the pleasure of hearing. The discourse, published in *La Réforme Sociale* of October 16th and November 1st, bears for title "The Social Constitution of the United States in 1888."

Speaking of the land and labor questions as influenced by the rapid increase of our population and the incoming yearly tide of emigrants from foreign parts, M. Jannet says :

"A very important fact is here to be noted, namely, that in our days there has arisen quite a hostile movement against further immigration, an evident desire of stopping this increasing influx of strangers. First, the Chinese were excluded, and this was justified by good reasons. It was important that a population of an entirely different race should not grow in the Pacific States and the West, just as the Negro race had grown up in the Southern States. At this moment, the opposition goes further : it is sought to exclude all poor immigrants, even those of European race. And we may reckon upon it as certain that, ere many years have passed, the United States will employ restrictive measures to prevent a too great increase in immigration from Europe.

"More than one law has already been enacted to hinder European capitalists from getting hold of lands. The citizens of the United States are determined, henceforth, to keep for themselves their patrimonial domain, immense as it is.

"Do the United States, then, feel that their population is

becoming too dense? No. Is the natural wealth of their territory exhausted? Certainly not yet. But notwithstanding the fact that this territorial wealth is still unexhausted, and that there is a wide and fruitful field for the investment of capital, it is none the less undeniable that the country no longer teems with the abundance of nature's gifts as it did some years ago. The vast territorial expanse between the Alleghanies and the Missouri is nearly all filled up. Instead of getting land there for nothing, as in former days, the would-be settler has to pay for it a comparatively high price. Lands to be had without payment are only to be had a great way off, further west, in the country between the Missouri and the Rocky Mountains. There the climate is dry and less propitious; woods are scarce, and in some regions artificial irrigation has to be resorted to.

"What conclusions shall we draw from all this? That to own land does not make a man rich; he must also have capital to enable him to cultivate it. Hence the culture of land in the Far West demands, as a necessary condition, the investment of capital to give value to the husbandman's possessions."

M. Jannet goes on to remark that, to a very large extent, the owners of land let it out to farmers. This system, he says, is doing great service to the country. Very many persons thus work for others in order to earn money enough to enable them to purchase afterwards farms of their own. "To attempt to settle on land, without any capital whatever, is for any man ruin, destruction."

In other territories of the Republic, especially where long droughts prevail, the only remunerative industry is cattle-raising. Immense extents of land are devoted to the rearing of oxen and horses. On these border-lands there is a continual rivalry, and not unfrequently bloody frays, between the capitalists and the settlers who plant their homesteads along the water-courses, and who represent the small farmer class devoted to raising cereals.

Great changes have occurred of late years in the agricultural condition of the Eastern and Middle States. The international commerce which has produced such an acute crisis in the value of land and all farming produce in Europe, has had its parallel in the American Republic. The wheat from India and the rich cereal crops grown in Manitoba have depressed the value of the same articles both in the Far West and in California.

In the Eastern and Middle States no more cereals are raised. Pasturage, dairy work, the growing of vegetables, the rearing of fowls, etc., have, according to M. Jannet, replaced the old agricultural occupations of New England, whose farmers and house-wives now aim to supply the daily markets of their numerous and populous cities.



So much for the land and its industries.

Now, as to the great manufacturing industries and the labor question. M. Jannet begins by asserting a fact which may be new to most of the readers of the REVIEW. It has been ascertained that the density of the population between Boston and Baltimore is nearly equal, square mile by square mile, to that of France, Belgium, and Germany. This is the region which is thickly studded with great cities. There are situated the rich deposits of coal and petroleum. It is also the seat of the great manufacturing industries. The economical conditions of this part of the United States are not unlike those of Western Europe.

Such is M. Jannet's estimate.

"Nevertheless," he says, "this same great district has a great advantage, as compared with us. And that is, that whosoever is active, laborious, persevering, and, above all, temperate in his habits (this is a vital condition in America)—every man who is temperate and saving can more easily raise himself up to competence and wealth than such a man could in our old Europe.

"A gentleman of wide experience in Worcester, a large industrial city of Massachusetts, proved some short time ago that of 100 leading manufacturers of that city, ninety began by being simple day-laborers. This tells us that in such a country there is room for all to make their way upward, and that many succeed in doing so."

This is the bright and hopeful side.

But the dark side has not escaped M. Jannet's observation. Women and even children have, as in France and Belgium, to work in our factories in order to enable the family to live. And although the workman's wages is nominally higher with us, the cost of living is, comparatively, so much greater that our laborers are worse off than in Europe. Then with us strikes are more frequent, and these are a serious drain on the workingman's resources.

While we are still following the sagacious French observer along the soil of New England into the Middle States, we must note one very natural omission in his work—the ruin of our ship-building industry, and the deterioration of our magnificent seafaring population into factory hands, wasting their lives away in the great shoemaking workshops of Lynn and Boston, or in the cotton and woollen factories along the coast and in the interior.

Before our great Civil War, and the deep disturbances it caused both in our social and in our economical conditions, we do not think there was in the world anything superior to the men who commanded and manned our fleets of clippers and steamships. Apart from the irreparable ruin caused to our native ship-builders, and to our carrying-trade on the ocean, there is the loss of our generations of hardy and intelligent sailors, who could have always

secured us the supremacy on sea along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

What statesman will take this matter up and revive our shipping industries, and with them call back into life the glorious American seamanship of fifty years ago?

If the politicians of the Atlantic States are too selfish and shortsighted to heed the warnings of quite recent events, why does not California set the patriotic example? She should be mistress of the Pacific.

M. Jannet next touches on what constitutes the great social peril of the United States, the birth and growth of that gigantic money power which not only threatens to oppress all individual and local initiative in industry and commerce, but to enslave hopelessly our laboring populations.

"In America," he says, "the heads of great industries, powerful companies like the Standard Oil Company, which monopolizes the sale of petroleum, the proprietors of the Pennsylvania coal mines, will of a sudden stop or limit their output, without any thought of the hundreds of workmen thrown out of employment.

"I am here pointing out," he continues, "what is the sorest spot in the social constitution of the United States. There have sprung up there great financial societies, which make up a power against which it is hopeless to struggle. Unhappily these societies have not always a conscientious regard to their duties, and treat their workmen with heartless cruelty." The author quotes, in support of his assertion, the report of the Pennsylvania Secretary of State in 1885: all but two millions of dollars stolen yearly from the workmen by a well-organized system of fraudulent weights and measures; the salaries paid only once a month, and cut down from ten to twenty per cent. in punishment of pretended infractions of the rules. Then the system of paying the balance of the miners' wages in orders on the company's clothing and provision stores—all the tyrannical wrongs which coöperative stores of the miners of Anzin so effectually remedied.

But the readers of the REVIEW, after all the harrowing scenes of last year's experience in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, need only to be reminded of the abuses arising from this irresponsible money power to appreciate the successful efforts made in France and Belgium to attack the evil in its very root.

Coming to the efforts made to withstand the oppression exercised actually, and the still greater oppression threatened in the future, by these "combines," "trusts," monopolies, etc., M. Jannet proceeds:

"The doctrine which seems to prevail in the socialistic organizations of the United States is the collectivism of Karl Marx. What it proposes is to make war on capital, war on industrial and commercial capital, with the aim of one day handing over all this



capital to the State and to the workingmen's corporations under the control of the State.

"These notions were extensively circulated among the Knights of Labor, although their present master-workman professed opinions diametrically opposed to them. The majority of the local branches of the order were, two years ago, more or less under the influence of Karl Marx's teaching, if one may judge from their official organs in the public press."

M. Jannet then gives a brief sketch of the order up to the present year. "Mr. Powderly," he says, "always repudiated, in his own name, the collectivist doctrines. He would settle all labor troubles by arbitration, or by a friendly understanding between employers and workmen. But strikes were always the last resource (*ultima ratio*) with the Knights of Labor, especially where they were the masters. Besides, the entrance into the order of numerous associations already formed, together with their staffs of politicians and leaders, did not conduce to unity and strength. These bodies had no idea of being entirely assimilated; they persisted in pursuing their own separate purposes. So that the general direction given by Mr. Powderly was not followed in practice by the mass of his adherents. The socialistic elements, underhand, did their own work and spread their own ideas."

The condemnation of the Canadian Knights is then mentioned. A branch of the order, with all its Masonic signs, etc., had been founded in Montreal by a Jew of the name of Heilbronner, and had caused no little trouble between employers and workmen in a country where the social peace had never before been disturbed. The Canadian bishops, together with the Cardinal-Archbishop of Quebec, condemned the order.

"In the United States, however," says M. Jannet, "the American bishops had equally good reasons for not condemning the Knights of Labor. For, in the Republic the workingmen, having no direct bond connecting them with their employers, no permanent relation founded on custom, stand in need of an organization to protect themselves against the exactions and extortions committed against them by the great industrial companies. And, as the direction given by Mr. Powderly to the order at the time [the condemnation was pronounced in Canada] was a just and proper one, it is easy to understand why the American bishops remonstrated with the Holy Father, and prevented his giving formal condemnation.

"After all, when we examine the official programmes issued by the Knights of Labor, and consider only the general direction given to the order by its present master-workman, we can discover, at most, a few economical errors. Now, Rome has never yet excommunicated anybody for economical errors; and this is fortunate. Mr. Powderly wants the State to work the railroads and telegraph

lines itself; wants it to issue bank-notes to an unlimited amount; and would have the State interfere in many ways in controlling labor.

"These are mere scientific errors—nothing more. And hence the prohibition uttered by the Canadian bishops against the Knights of Labor was suspended in consequence of a memoir presented to the Propaganda by Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore."

The decision of the Propaganda, as well as the more recent decision of the Holy Father, with respect to the Knights, is not, as M. Jannet remarks, to be considered in any wise as an *approbation*. "The majority of the American hierarchy," he adds, "who took part in this proceeding, were careful to declare that the Holy See had not approved the order. Every Bishop, in his own diocese, gave the Knights a severe warning, recommending most especially that they should not violate the freedom of other laborers who do not belong to their association, if they did not wish to court, later on, a sentence of condemnation."

"But," concludes M. Jannet, "there never will be any occasion for condemning them, since this gigantic soap-bubble has already burst."

The conclusion, we are happy to say, was a hasty one. The order, though apparently much weakened by defection and divisions, is powerful still. They have once more held their general convention, and again placed Mr. Powderly at their head as General Master-Workman. This, with the latest instruction of Leo XIII. regarding them, will be an inducement to be more careful in selecting and admitting their members; more careful still in avoiding everything that savors of socialism, even of the State socialism advocated by Mr. Powderly.

With men like Cardinal Gibbons and his associates in the Episcopacy to counsel and warn their leaders, the Knights may long fill an important place in our social economy, and stand as a bulwark against the encroachments of combined capital on the rights of the workingman.

We need such organizations, when well-principled and wisely directed, in our great and free country. But what we need more—and what must be the joint creation of the clergy, the capitalists, and the workingmen themselves—are such societies, founded on Christian charity, as those existing in France and Belgium, and which we have only glanced at in the preceding pages.

There is among American employers too much of inborn generosity, love of justice, and appreciation of the rights of manhood, not to make us hope for prompt coöperation from them when rightly appealed to.

We want combined action in doing the work of God and the brotherhood. The time needs it, and the country is ripe for it.

## SAVONAROLA.

**J**EROME SAVONAROLA was born at Ferrara in 1452. Naturally of a grave disposition, he soon manifested an enthusiastic piety, and at the age of twenty-three he donned the habit of a Friar-Preacher at Bologna. His strict observance of the rule, his great talents, and, not least of all, his remarkably striking presence, drew upon him the admiration of the multitude; so that his superior determined to utilize his influence in the pulpit. His first attempt at preaching, however, was not a success. It was made in 1482, in the church of St. Lawrence, in Florence; and when he had finished, says Burlamachi, one of his most zealous admirers, he found that only twenty persons had remained.<sup>1</sup> Both he and his audience having decided that he was no orator, he for a time occupied a chair of philosophy, but soon abandoned the study of Aristotle and St. Thomas for that of Scripture. Now he was content, for his contemplative nature fully appreciated the lofty ideas and the mysterious and figurative style of the divine books. For several years he had devoted himself, night and day, to his Biblical studies, when he was again unexpectedly brought before the public. It was the celebrated Pico della Mirandola who was the means of pushing the retiring student into publicity, and of causing him to enter upon a career which was to prove his destruction. This great scholar, one of the brightest luminaries of his own or any other age, had heard Savonarola lecture at Reggio, and had been so impressed by his eloquence that he prevailed upon Lorenzo de Medici to call the friar to Florence. In 1489 Savonarola was appointed professor of Scripture to the young religious of the convent of St. Mark, and as his oratorical powers had greatly developed since his failure at St. Lawrence's, he soon acquired a great reputation. Before long, impelled by the enthusiasm he excited, he reappeared in the pulpit; and voluptuous Florence was astonished at his denunciations of her vices and at the threats of chastisement which, by command of God, he said, he poured forth. The sermons of Savonarola, as we have them, are not from his own hand; they were taken down, as delivered, by some of his auditors.<sup>2</sup> But imperfect as they are, we can readily imagine the effect they must have produced. "His eloquence was not that which comes from the use of the orator's arts, or from a

<sup>1</sup> *Life of F. Jerome Savonarola*, Lucca, 1761, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Tiraboschi; b. iii., c. 6.



depth of reasoning, or from an emotion agitating the orator's self. It was an eloquence which seemed to despise all human aids, and which, like the mystical figures of Fra Angelico, looks toward heaven and does not touch the earth. . . . Savonarola is like no other orator. True or pretended, he is a prophet; he has the visions, the incoherence, the seizures, the figurative language, the rashness of one. For this reason, rather than by means of his talent, great as it was, he captivated the multitude."<sup>1</sup> Several years before the Italian expedition of Charles VIII., Savonarola had predicted to his auditors that a foreign prince, led by the Lord, would become master of Italy without drawing his sword; and when, in 1494, he heard of the preparations being made in France, he quoted the passage of Genesis which threatens the deluge, and cried out: "Oh! ye just, enter into the ark. Behold, the cataracts of heaven are opened; I see the plains inundated, and the mountains disappearing in the midst of the waters. Behold the day of the Lord's vengeance!" His predictions were universally believed, and his authority over the multitude became so great that a contemporary historian says that posterity will find it just as difficult to believe as he finds it hard, having witnessed these events, to describe them.<sup>2</sup> A change came over gay and voluptuous Florence. Vice of every kind disappeared, and piety became so general that Burlamachi tells us that the days of the primitive Church seemed to have returned.<sup>3</sup> Nor was the eloquence of the friar restricted to a combat with vice alone. The Renaissance in letters and art had been more favorable to science than to faith, and for about a century an almost idolatrous worship had been extended to the works of Pagan antiquity, to the detriment of Scriptural and Patristic lore. Paganism had so far corrupted the minds of men that even the members of the Roman Academy of Pomponius Lætus were accused of thinking that the Christian faith rested on light foundations.<sup>4</sup> Art, as well as literature and true science, had suffered from this revival of Pagan sentiment.<sup>5</sup> The painter and the sculptor, influenced by the works exhibited in the Medici gardens,

<sup>1</sup> Christophe: *History of the Papacy in the 15th Century*, v. ii., b. 16. Lyons, 1863.

<sup>2</sup> Nardi: *History of the City of Florence*, b. ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup> Canensius: *Life of Paul II.*, p. 78. Tiraboschi: v. vi., p. ii., b. 2.

<sup>5</sup> "Pagan ideas again flourish; the books, statues, and buildings of Paganism are restored; modern works are modeled after the ancient, to the sacrifice of originality and of naturalness; the authority of a philosopher or of a poet is weighed against that of the Scriptures or of a Father—professors even say, 'Christ teaches thus, Aristotle and Plato thus;' the Platonic sublimity disappears in theosophical delirium; only Pagan virtues are praised, and the names of Greeks and Romans are substituted for those received at baptism. . . . Lorenzo de Medici sings sacred hymns to please his mother, and makes obscene jokes to gratify his boon companions." Cantù: *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse XI.

had adopted naturalism as a system, and, banishing the ideal, produced merely the expression of human beauty—decency and modesty were ignored, and Savonarola indignantly asked the artists why they put their mistresses upon the altars, and why they pictured the Blessed Virgin like a courtesan.<sup>1</sup> All this was changed by the Dominican reformer. On two different occasions the Florentines made immense bonfires, and performed a real and meritorious *auto-da-fé*, by throwing into the flames their books on impure love, their lascivious pictures and statues, while joyous strains of music floated over the great square of the cathedral.

From the very commencement of his preaching Savonarola had proclaimed the necessity of purifying the sanctuary; but at first, in this matter, he restrained his usual impetuosity, and confined himself to declamations against the laxity, then but too prevalent, of ecclesiastical discipline. But his growing popularity soon affected his judgment and banished his reserve. From the accession of Alexander VI. to the Papacy, he bitterly inveighed against that Pontiff, and consequently his auditors were divided into two factions. His partisans were known as *frateschi*, or “friarites,” and sometimes as *piangoni*, or “weepers,” while those who, either in good or bad faith, trembled lest his denunciation would injure both Church and state, were called by his followers *tepidi*, or “lukewarm,” and *arrabiati*, or “madmen.”<sup>2</sup> To neutralize the influence of the Dominican, the *arrabiati* made use of the Augustinian, Mariano da Gennazzano, a friend of the Medici, and a man esteemed as much for his austere morals as for his talents,<sup>3</sup> and of whom Savonarola himself said that “if he had the eloquence of Mariano, he would be the first of orators.”<sup>4</sup> But the impassioned genius of the agitator still held the people entranced. A Franciscan named Dominic de Ponzo was then put forward to stem the torrent, but the Grand Council, a legislative body instituted after Savonarola had procured the expulsion of Piero de Medici, prohibited his preaching. The Dominican had now become the real ruler of Florence, and the devotion of the citizens to their liberator took the form of insanity. Nerli tells us that they often interrupted their prayers to rush from the churches, and to the cry of “*Viva Cristo*,” they would dance in circles, formed of friars and laymen, placed alternately.<sup>5</sup> But the *arrabiati* did not lose courage, and the war of factions became so general that the very children took

<sup>1</sup> *Sermon for the Saturday before 2d Sunday of Lent.*

<sup>2</sup> Nerli: *Commentaries on the Civil Affairs of Florence*, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> Poliziano and Pontano greatly laud him as a preacher.

<sup>4</sup> Tiraboschi: v. 6, b. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*, b. iv., p. 75.

part in it, and showed their zeal by pelting each other with stones.<sup>1</sup> The opponents of Savonarola, most of them partisans of the exiled Piero de Medici, now took the more efficacious means of discrediting their enemy by denouncing him to the Pope. Some of his most bitter sermons were sent to Rome, and the Augustinian, Mariano, who had been exiled from Florentine territory, preached before the Pontiff and the Sacred College a most fiery sermon, in which he cried out: "Burn, Holy Father, burn this instrument of the devil; burn, I tell you, this scandal of the whole Church."<sup>2</sup> At first, Pope Alexander contented himself with charging Cardinal Caraffa, the protector of the Dominican order, to check the indiscretions of the friar; but since the cardinal, himself a reformer, took no active measures, we must suppose that the Pontiff decided to let the matter rest.

At this time the worst accusation against Savonarola was that of being more of a tribune, yea, of a demagogue, than of an ecclesiastic and a friar. The charge of heresy, made by the *arrabiati*, was unfounded; in the heat of improvisation he may have been, and doubtless was, inexact in his expressions, but he had deliberately attacked no Catholic teaching. As for his political notions, he was a thorough republican, and carried his principles to their utmost logical conclusions; he was a firm advocate of universal suffrage. All, said he, are interested in the State; all, therefore, should have a voice in the government.<sup>3</sup> Hence his institution of the *Consiglio Grande* of a thousand members, elected by the votes of all the citizens, and that of the *Consiglio degli Scelti* (Council of the Select), formed of eighty persons of over forty years of age, chosen by the former. Savonarola no longer inhabited the cell of a friar; that modest apartment had been turned into a hall of audience and of political wrangling. Florence soon found that she had exchanged the despotism of the Medici for that of the friar, for despite his liberal institutions, the reformer allowed no political measure to be taken without his permission. Marino Sanuto, a Venetian chronicler, tells us that "a stone could not be moved without his consent. . . . He was lord and governor of Florence."<sup>4</sup> It is worthy of note that Machiavelli, though not a partisan of Savonarola, says, in his *Discourses*, that so great a man must be treated with respect, and he tells Leo X. that the Florentine state can be firmly re-established only by the restoration of the friar's *Consiglio Grande*. Guicciardini, whose *History* was written with a different animus from that pervading his unedited works, allows, in these

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Burlamachi: p. 34. Nardi: b. ii., p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Nardi: b. i., p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Chronicles of Venice*.—Burchard: *Diary*.



latter, his conscience to speak; and in his book on the *Government of Florence* he admits: "We owe much to this friar, who, without shedding a drop of blood, knew how to accomplish what otherwise would have cost much blood and disorder. Before him Florence had been governed by a restricted circle of *ottimati*, and then she had fallen into all the excesses of popular rule, which would have produced anarchy. He alone, from the beginning, knew how to be liberal without loosening the reins." But the reader will be pleased to hear the reformer himself on this subject. In the *Abridgment of his Revelations*, published by Bzovius, he says to the Florentines: "After examining with care the state of your city, and the coming revolutions in its form of government which would seem inevitable, I have persuaded myself that the great change will not be effected without danger or without even the effusion of blood, unless Divine Providence comes to your aid out of consideration for the justice and piety of the citizens who are worthy. In this spirit, and relying on this hope, I earnestly besought the people to be reconciled to the Lord, and to merit His mercy by renewed fervor and sincere repentance. I commenced my discourses on this point, on St. Matthew's Day, Sept. 25, 1494. From that time the citizens appeared so zealous in the good works I had prescribed, that it pleased God to give tangible proof of His reconciliation with us; in fact, in the month of November, by a miracle of heaven's protection, you witnessed the desired change, and without bloodshed or other scandal. Now, since there was a question of proposing to you a new form of government, I assembled all the magistrates and notables of the city in the cathedral of Florence, excluding only those whose sex or condition prohibited their being called. . . . Having discoursed for some time on what had been written by philosophers, statesmen, and the most able theologians touching the best way of governing a state, I explained my opinion as to the form most suitable to the genius and profit of the Florentines. In the following discourses I proposed four articles, the necessity of which was admitted: I. Religion should be the basis and the first rampart of our government. II. All private interests should yield to the public good. III. By forgetting all past injuries and quarrels there would ensue a general and sincere peace, and in no way should any trouble accrue to those who hitherto administered the affairs of the state. And I added that there should always remain liberty of appeal from the tribunal of the six judges, so that no private person could ever usurp the sovereign authority. It was also my idea to establish a Great Council, composed of the wisest and most illustrious citizens, after the model of the Council of Venice; and that thereafter all offices, etc., should be conferred in the name of the people of Florence, and

not in the name of any single person, who might thus take occasion to aspire to tyranny. I made no difficulty of assuring the assembly that all I had proposed was conformable to God's law and to His will. . . . It was not only because of my peculiar knowledge of the Divine Will, but because of many conclusions of my reason, that I undertook to convince you of the advantages of this new form of government, the best fitted for your needs, the most favorable to liberty, and also the most apt to give great glory to your republic, which will thereby become more flourishing, both in the spiritual and in the temporal order."

Great numbers, incited, of course, by the partisans of the exiled Medici, soon revolted against the dictatorship imposed upon the city, and allied themselves with those who opposed the friar on religious grounds. In 1494 the superiors of the Dominicans deemed it prudent to forbid Savonarola to preach the Lenten course, although a Brief of Pope Alexander permitted him to give it. His followers then appealed to the Pontiff, and then Alexander, who is said to have been Savonarola's foe from the beginning, quashed the prohibition. In fact, during the early troubles of the Dominican, Alexander VI. paid but little attention to him; when he thought of him at all, it was rather with admiration. He had even conceived the idea, says Burlamachi, of enrolling the friar in the Sacred College. But now Alexander, although not prohibiting Savonarola from preaching, summoned him to Rome to explain his conduct. The reply was an allegation of infirmity and the need that Florence had of his presence. Then the Pontiff threatened the friar with the censures of the Church, and menaced the city of Florence with an interdict. The Florentine merchants, fearing the results of this measure, and many of the cardinals, who were rather favorable to the agitator, prevailed upon Alexander to withdraw his citation. However, the Pontiff gave an eloquent rebuke to his stubborn son, by leaving it to his own conscience whether or not he would continue to preach. This moderation seems to have somewhat affected Savonarola, for he withdrew from the pulpit, substituting, however, the friar Dominic of Pescia, also a Dominican, and a man of reputed holiness, who was far less fiery than himself.

The enemies of the friar regarded this retreat from the pulpit as a triumph for themselves; but when, in October, 1495, he broke his silence, they suffered from one of his most virulent tirades. Heaven, he said, would take condign vengeance upon those who had presumed to interfere with its work, namely, the establishment of popular government. To this denunciation he added new declamations on the need of reform in the Church. Pope Alexander now ordered the vicar-general of the Dominicans at Bologna to

examine into the charges against his subject, and to punish him, according to the rules of the Order, if he were found guilty. During the trial the friar was not to preach; but, in spite of this prohibition, Savonarola continued in the pulpit. The Pontiff now demanded that the republic should place the agitator in his hands, and as his request was not heeded, he launched an excommunication against him.<sup>1</sup> This sentence was read in six churches of Florence on June 18th, 1497. At first Savonarola seemed inclined to submit. He withdrew to his cell, admitted no visitors, and wrote a humble letter to the Pope. Alexander's answer was truly paternal. Among other encouraging remarks, he says: "In spite of facts, we begin to believe that you have not spoken in malice, but rather in simplicity, and out of zeal for the vineyard of the Lord." He concluded with a promise that if the friar would abstain from preaching, and come to Rome, he would annul the censures pronounced. To this letter Savonarola replied, demanding to be judged at Florence. However, he, for some time, respected the censures, and abstained from preaching. But, after six months, being asked by the magistrates, who were all *frateschi*, to reappear in the pulpit, and reconvert the people, who, in the interval of his silence, had resumed their gayeties, he yielded to the temptation, and boldly defied his excommunication. On Christmas he celebrated the customary three Masses of that festival, gave the Eucharist to his religious, and, after a solemn procession around his convent,<sup>2</sup> announced that he would at once resume his preaching in the cathedral. When this new departure was made public, the vicar-general, in the absence of Rinaldo Orsini, Archbishop of Florence, convoked the Chapter of the cathedral, and a prohibition to assist at the proposed sermons was issued to all the clergy; the parish-priests were ordered to inform the faithful that, owing to the censures hanging over Savonarola, any one who attended his discourses would incur the same penalties. In spite of this action of the Chapter, the friar announced that he would follow the inspiration of God.<sup>3</sup>

From this moment Savonarola was at a disadvantage. People felt, and he must have felt, that his rebellion destroyed the influ-

<sup>1</sup> Alexander VI. said to Bonsi, envoy of Florence: "I have read the sermons of your friar, and have talked with those who have heard them. He dares to say that the Pope is a broken sword; that he who believes in excommunication is a heretic; that he himself, sooner than ask for absolution, will go to hell. He has been excommunicated, not because of false insinuations, nor at anyone's instigation, but for his disobedience to our command that he should enter the new Tusco-Roman congregation. We do not condemn him because of his good works; but we insist that he ask pardon for his petulant arrogance, and we will gladly accord him absolution when he humbles himself at our feet."

<sup>2</sup> For some time Savonarola had been prior of the Convent of St. Mark.

<sup>3</sup> Nardi, b. ii., p. 42.



ence, by weakening the authority, of his words. To obviate this difficulty he now attacked the validity of his excommunication, declaring, first, that the censures of a wicked Pope are of no weight; second, that Alexander had excommunicated him without reason; third, that the censures were pronounced against the "sower of tares," and he was not such a one.<sup>1</sup> The arguments with which he defended these propositions were of the weakest kind, and to reassure his partisans, he, one day, had recourse to a device which was terribly impressive. With the Holy Eucharist in his hand, he called upon God to consume him with fire from heaven if he was deceiving the people, and if the Pope's censure, in his case, was valid. At this time, says Christophe, "his talent certainly appears great, but we can divine that he is not at ease, not sure of himself. Savonarola perceives, in the minds of his hearers, difficulties which disquiet them, and to which he is compelled to respond. He invents trivial similes that he may excite their laughter; he encumbers himself with suppositions; he advances hazardous and equivocal principles, the consequences of which he would certainly repudiate." In fact, from the day that Savonarola openly defied the Holy See, his waning eloquence and deficient logic proved that he well realized his false position.

When the news of the friar's daring rebellion reached Rome, Pope Alexander threatened serious measures against Florence if the delinquent were not sent to the Eternal City. The republic partially yielded. Savonarola was commanded to keep silent, but his disciple, Friar Dominic of Pescia, continued to preach in the strain of the master, and his rashness precipitated the ruin of both. One day a Franciscan friar, named Francis of Puglia, while preaching in the church of Santa Croce, declared that Friar Jerome was an impostor, adding that he was ready to try the "ordeal by fire" with the said Jerome. At that moment Friar Dominic was holding forth in the church of St. Lawrence, and the news of the Franciscan's challenge was immediately carried to him. He at once informed his hearers, and accepted the defiance. When Friar Francis found himself called upon to make good his boasting offer, he lost courage, and tried to escape by pleading that he had challenged Savonarola, not Dominic. This incident was painful to Savonarola, but how could he disavow his companion when he himself had often declared that if his arguments did not produce conviction of the truth of his teaching, he was ready to invoke the supernatural in its defence? He accepted the challenge, and for himself, but insisted that a Papal legate and all the foreign ambassadors should be present at the ordeal; furthermore, he demanded

---

<sup>1</sup> *Sermon for last Sunday of Lent.*

<sup>2</sup> Nardi: b. ii., p. 44.

that if he came unharmed out of the fire, the Church should at once be reformed. Friar Francis refused these conditions, but the factions had entered into the spirit of the thing, and the mob would not miss the show. The impetuous Dominic, unlike the timid Francis, was panting for the terrible trial, and there were many Franciscans more brave, or more confident, than their brother. Finally, the affair was laid before the magistrates, and they decided that the ordeal should be held. As champions the magistrates designated, on the part of Savonarola, Friar Dominic, and on the part of the Franciscan challenger, a lay-brother named Julian Rondinelli. Certain propositions, the truth or falsity of which was to be established, in the opinion of many, by this curious means, were drawn up by Dominic. They were: "The Church needs reformation. She will be chastised. She will be renovated. Florence will be punished, but she will afterwards prosper. The infidels will be converted. All these things will soon happen. The excommunication of Savonarola is null." The magistrates then appointed ten citizens, five for each party, as a commission to settle any differences that might arise, and all was ready for that trial, the worth of which we doubt, but which, in those days, commanded the confidence of the people.<sup>1</sup> Previous to the experiment, however, the magistrates sent messengers to Rome to obtain the Pontiff's consent to the undertaking. A consistory was held, and the authorization was refused; Alexander simply wrote to the Franciscans, praising their devotion to the Holy See, and encouraging them to continue in their combat against error.<sup>2</sup>

On April 7th, 1498, in the centre of the Square of the Magistracy (in modern times, Square of the Grand Duke), was to be

<sup>1</sup> The Church never authorized or approved of ordeals, but, they being recognized in the laws of the barbarians, she was obliged to tolerate them. The prejudices of humanity are not easily eradicated; witness the number of superstitions in our own day, and among the most cultivated. As far back as the ninth century Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, wrote against the *damnable* opinion that God interfered in the ordeals; in the eleventh, Ivo of Chartres supports his condemnation of them by a letter of Pope Stephen V. to the bishop of Mayence. Popes Celestine III., Innocent III., and Honorius III. condemned them, as did also the Fourth Council of Lateran. The scholastic theologians teach that they are injurious to God, and favorable to lies. As for the question, whether or not there was ever anything of the supernatural in the frequent success of these ordeals, see an excellent dissertation in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions*, v. 24.

<sup>2</sup> In reference to this request of the magistrates of Florence, the Abbé Christophe says that he is astonished to find that Carle, in his *History of Friar Jerome Savonarola* (Paris, 1848), cites the letter of Alexander VI. as an approbation of the proposed ordeal. "If we rightly understand the words of the Pontiff," adds Christophe, "they do not contradict the testimony of the historian (*Miscellanies* of Baluze, v. iv., Burlamachi, p. 132), who affirms that the decision of the consistory was averse to the authorization. They simply contain a eulogy on the *fervor, zeal, devotion* displayed by the Franciscans in their struggle with Savonarola."

seen an immense scaffolding, paved with bricks, and covered with combustible material. Two tribunes arose before it, destined to be occupied by the magistrates and by the friars of the two Orders. The square was filled with anxious spectators, the house-tops were crowded. At the appointed hour Rondinelli, at the head of a long file of Franciscans, and Dominic of Pescia, flanked by Savonarola, and followed by a procession of Dominicans, entered the square, and took their places. It was observed that Savonarola carried a silver pyx, containing the Holy Eucharist. Rondinelli advanced to the magistrates, and cried out: "Behold me ready for the ordeal. Sinner that I am, I know the flames will consume me. But let not Friar Dominic, therefore, boast of victory; he must take his turn in the fire. If he comes out unharmed let him be proclaimed the conqueror; otherwise, no."<sup>1</sup> The judges replied that his demand would be granted. Then ensued a curious scene. The referees feared that the champions might have concealed some charms under their robes, and ordered them to change them for others handed to them. Rondinelli was perfectly willing, but at first Dominic hesitated. "Never mind," cried the Franciscan, "his robe will burn with his body." Then the Dominican changed his garments, but retained a crucifix. When he was ordered to lay it down, Rondinelli said: "Let him keep it—it is of wood, and will burn with the rest." Then Savonarola handed the Holy Eucharist to Dominic. But the crowd, believing that the flames would, perforce, respect the Blessed Sacrament, declared that if the Dominican were allowed to carry it, the trial would not be fair.<sup>2</sup> Savonarola persisted, and threatened to abandon the ordeal. An endless dispute ensued, and the promised spectacle vanished in ridicule.

This fiasco was the signal for the fall of Savonarola, for one cannot trifle with the mob. Had he not been protected by the Holy Eucharist, the agitator would not have regained his convent in safety. In vain he mounted the pulpit to pacify the crowd; his eloquence was not heeded, for all now felt that Savonarola was but an ordinary mortal. The day after was Palm Sunday, and, while one of the Dominicans was preaching in the cathedral, a crowd of young men burst upon the congregation, a voice cried: "To St. Mark's!" and in a few moments the convent was attacked. The magistrates, tired of him who had made them, more than winked at the outbreak, and ordered the few laymen who had rushed to defend the Dominicans, out of the building. The doors were burnt away, and the mob rushed in search of its prey. Savonarola

<sup>1</sup> Nardi, b. ii., p. 48; Burlamachi, p. 140; Anonymous *Life of F. Jerome Savonarola* (Geneva, 1781), c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Nardi, b. ii., p. 45; Nerli, p. 78; Anonymous author, *supra*, pp. 101, 102.



was found in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, in company with the imprudent Dominic of Pescia. He was saved from the crowd by some municipal commissioners, and, together with Dominic, lodged in prison; a few hours afterwards Friar Sylvester Maruffi was also arrested.

Information of Savonarola's imprisonment was immediately sent to Pope Alexander, and he ordered the magistrates to send the friar to Rome. Had the command been heeded, the unfortunate man would, doubtless, have been confined, perhaps even for life, but the catastrophe would have been averted. The magistrates now appointed a commission of six citizens and two canons (these latter as Papal commissaries) for the trial of the three Dominicans; nearly all were declared adversaries of the accused. The trial lasted from the 9th to the 19th of April. During the first interrogatories Savonarola was firm and collected, but when, in accordance with the detestable and foolish custom of the time, he was put to "the question," as the torture was called, he quite naturally weakened.<sup>1</sup> "Here," says Christophe, "we experience a painful uncertainty. What confidence are we to place in the avowals made by the accused? Although the *Acts* of the trial are printed with the title, *Authentic Copy of the Trial of Jerome Savonarola*, and although the signature of the friar is found at the end, there are strong presumptions against the value of the admissions they contain. Firstly, the composition of the tribunal, the preamble of the interrogatory, the testimony of historians,—all prove that the proceedings were not conducted with the calm impartiality of justice. Secondly, it is certain that Savonarola more than once retracted, and showed much vacillation, during the course of his interrogatory; that he frequently declared, in presence of the Papal commissioners, that what he had said and predicted was the simple truth, and that his own contradictions had been extorted by the fear of torture; that he acknowledged that torture would force him to admit whatever his enemies might wish, because he knew himself to be unable to support such pain. Hence the Pontifical representatives were much embarrassed. Finally, the commission has been accused of having falsified the depositions of Savonarola, they having realized the impossibility of obtaining real facts sufficiently serious, and it is said that a notary, called *Ser Ceccone*, aided in this odious stratagem. It is true that it is an apologist of Savonarola who asserts this,<sup>2</sup> and that we should mistrust the testimony of those who trembled before

<sup>1</sup> The characteristic sneer of Roscoe that the torture is the "last reason of theologians" is uncalled for, for in what civil tribunal, down to the last century, and in part of that, was it not used?

<sup>2</sup> Burlamachi: pp. 155-160.

the visions of the friar; but we find the same accusation, formulated, with no less directness, in several contemporary historians who had not the same interest as Burlamachi in attacking the equity of the commission." In fact, Nardi asserts (b. ii. p. 47) that "at the time, and afterwards, there was much doubt as to the truth and quality of the proceedings," and, that he himself may not be accused of hiding the truth, he narrates the following anecdote: "A noble citizen, who had been one of the examiners of the said friars, and who had been chosen because of his enmity to them, was met by me in his villa; and being questioned by me, with deliberate intention, concerning the truth of the said proceedings, he ingenuously replied, in the presence of his wife, that it was true that in the report of Friar Jerome's trial some things had been omitted and some things added."<sup>1</sup>

When the examination had come to an end, the magistrates deliberated as to the sentence to be passed upon the unfortunate religious. A few wished to refer the matter to the Pontiff, as the accused were ecclesiastics, and besides, they were leniently disposed, and thought that the friars' only chance of escaping the death penalty lay in their being placed in Alexander's hands. But the majority insisted that the culprits could not be accorded any ecclesiastical immunity, as they were excommunicated. The party of severity carried the day, and Pope Alexander was requested to appoint commissioners to preside at the sentence and its execution. The Pontiff commissioned Joachim Turriani, the general of the Dominicans, and Francis Ramolina, an auditor of the governor of Rome, and after some interrogatories they ratified the proceedings, and the friars were declared guilty of schism, heresy, persecution of the Church, and seduction of the people. They were sentenced to be burned at the stake. On May 23d Florence witnessed the last act of this terrible drama. In the square of the Grand Duke, where two months before Savonarola had seen his credit destroyed, another apparatus was now arranged for his death. Early in the morning the three friars went to confession, received Holy Communion with every manifestation of a sincere piety, and marched out to their last earthly suffering. Arrived in the square, they had to undergo the humiliating ceremony of degradation, being deprived, one at a time, of all their sacerdotal vestments. Burlamachi and Nardi assert that the prelate, whose duty it was to perform this act, said to Savonarola: "I separate thee from the Church militant and triumphant;" and that the unfortunate firmly and loudly replied: "From the Church militant, yes—from the Church triumphant, no!" The three friars were then asked

<sup>1</sup> For other writers who bring the same charge against the commission, see Muratori, *Annals of Italy*, p. 1498.

whether they accepted the plenary indulgence which the Pontiff accorded them, and they all three bowed their heads and answered in the affirmative. They were then strangled, and their bodies reduced to ashes, which, to prevent any superstitious veneration, were thrown into the Arno.<sup>1</sup>

The following reflections of Christophe on the character of Savonarola are worthy of the reader's attention: "Certain names have a fatality attached to them—we can neither praise them nor blame them by halves. Some make a fanatic, a sectarian, an impostor, of Savonarola; others, an apostle, a saint. The fact is, there is something of all these in the Dominican. If we open the door of his cell in St. Mark's and there contemplate him at the foot of the crucifix, attenuated by fasting and drowned in an ecstasy of prayer; if we follow him to Santa Maria del Fiore and hear him reproaching voluptuous Florence with her vices, Savonarola is a saint, an apostle. But if we turn to the other side, and behold the tribune who mixes politics with religion, the declaimer who inveighs against the existing powers, the seer who opposes a divine mission to the authority of the head of the Church, Savonarola is very like a fanatic, a sectarian, an impostor. Unfortunately he finished his life with the latter character; such was the impression he left with the spectators when he left the scene, and we may well ask ourselves whether, if he had preserved the popular favor, he would have anticipated the role of the monk of Wittenburg. Protestants appear not to doubt it, for they claim Savonarola as one of their forerunners. But they forget that this monk broke the link which might have connected him with their rebellion, on the day when, at the foot of the stake, he accepted the absolution of the Pope, and handed down to posterity that tardy but solemn proof of his repentance. . . . Savonarola knew not how to be either saint or apostle. We would hesitate to call him a sectary, and we would dislike still more to style him an impostor. We regard him as a sincere, but a prodigiously imaginative preacher. If we have studied him rightly, he appears to have been carried away in the current of an unregulated imagination from the day when he began his prophetic exposition of the Apocalypse to that when he openly substituted for the authority of the Church that of his own pretended celestial mission. Undoubtedly his eloquence is wonderful, but it is that of a vehement declaimer rather than that of a solid and enlightened teacher. We see in it the violent and convulsive agitation of a fever, rather than an effort of powerful and healthy thought. His strength does not warm; it burns, it boils over like the lava from a volcano. It does not illumine,

---

<sup>1</sup> Razzi: *MS. Life of Savonarola Sanuto*; loc. cit., b. 6.



it dazzles ; it does not guide, it pulls ; it does not march, it tumbles. His spirit cannot understand the positive side of things. Savonarola is seldom true ; exaggeration seems to be his domain ; his figures are colossal, his situations forced, his end greater than his means. We need not be surprised if a man so organized, with such power of imagination and such weakness of sense, influenced by the enthusiasm which drinks his words, and by an idolatrous worship accorded him,—if such a man becomes intoxicated with himself, . . . and if he believes himself to be the envoy of the Lord. Savonarola succumbed to the hatred of factions which he had excited against himself. In our days he would have succumbed to ridicule."

Protestants have frequently spoken of Savonarola as a precursor of the "Reformation." Luther insisted that the unfortunate Dominican taught the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and in 1523 he caused Savonarola's meditation on the 70th psalm to be circulated throughout Germany, together with a preface by himself, in which he declared that Friar Jerome was his forerunner, "although some of the theological mud yet stuck to the feet of the holy man." He asserts that Savonarola taught his own cardinal doctrine, and that "*for this reason* he was burnt by the Pope," and he adds: "Christ canonized him because he did not rely upon vows or a cowl, upon masses or a rule, but upon meditation on the gospel of peace ; and covered with the breastplate of justice, armed with the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, he enlisted, not in the Order of Preachers, but in the army of the Christian Church." Savonarola was not put to death by the Pope, nor was his fate owing to the cause alleged by the ex-Augustinian, and the very work upon which the latter relies to prove his point shows the former's orthodoxy in the doctrine of grace. Luther draws comfort from the following passage: "I will hope in the Lord, and soon I shall be freed from all tribulation. And by what merit ? Not by mine, but by Thine, Lord. I offer not my own justice, but I seek Thy mercy. The Pharisees gloried in their justice ; hence they had not that of God, which is obtained by grace alone, and no one will ever be just before God, merely because of having performed the works of the law. Soldier of Christ, what is your mind in these combats ? Have you faith, or not ? Yes, I have (you answer). Know then that this is a great grace of God, for faith is His gift, and not for our works." But this passage is explained by its continuation, for, meditating upon the next verse, "Incline Thy ear unto me, and save me," Savonarola says: "Let thy sorrow show, if it can, one sinner, even the greatest one, who has turned to the Lord, and has not been received and justified. . . . Hast thou not heard the Lord saying that whenever a sinner weeps,

and grieves for his sins, He will not remember his iniquities? . . . Hast thou fallen? Arise, and mercy will find thee. Art thou being ruined? Cry out, and mercy will come." That Savonarola's belief concerning grace was far from the Lutheran, is shown by the *Rule for a Good Life*, which, when requested by his jailor to leave him some souvenir, he wrote on the cover of a book. In it he says: "A good life depends altogether upon grace; hence we must *strive to acquire it*, and when we have received it, we must try to increase it. . . . It is certainly a free gift of God; but examination into our sins, and meditation on the vanity of worldly things, prepare us for grace; confession and communion dispose us to receive it. . . . *Perseverance in good works*, in confession, and in all that disposes us to grace, is the true and sure means to increase it." Protestants who would like to claim Savonarola as a precursor of the Lutheran movement, should attend to the following passage, taken from the fourth book of his *Triumph of the Cross*. "Since Peter was made His vicar by Christ, and was constituted by Him pastor of the whole Church, it follows that all the successors of Peter have the same power. And since the bishops of the Roman See hold the place of Peter, it is evident that the Roman Church is the leader and mistress of all the churches, and that the entire congregation of the faithful should be united with the Roman Pontiff. He, therefore, who differs in doctrine from the unity of the Roman Church, certainly recedes from Christ. But all heretics differ from that Church; therefore, they are out of the right path, and cannot be called Christians. He is to be styled a heretic who perverts the sacred pages and the doctrine of the Holy Roman Church, and, following the sect of his own choice, obstinately perseveres in it. As has often been said, truth agrees with truth; all truths confirm each other. But heretics so differ among themselves that they agree in almost nothing; it is very plain, therefore, that they are strangers to truth. However, the doctrine of the Roman Church, in all that pertains to faith and morals, is one; and although Catholic teachers are almost innumerable, they neither depart from that doctrine nor wish to differ from it. The kingdom of Christ and of the Church militant is not only established to endure until the end of the world; after the renovation of the universe, it will exist forever, as the Gospel and all the Scriptures and the monuments of the saints testify. Heretics, who have bitterly persecuted Catholics, have not been able to preserve their lines against the Roman Church, but have been utterly routed, together with their depraved dogmas and the obstinacy of their followers. It is certain, then, that their false volumes come not from God, that their doctrine is not Christian."

In 1548 the celebrated Dominican, Ambrose Catarino (Lancellotto Politi), published at Venice a *Discourse against the Doctrine and Prophecies of Friar Jerome Savonarola*, in which he drew attention to many propositions which he deemed contrary to Catholic teaching; but he declared that he did "not combat Savonarola, who was worthy of compassion rather than of blame, but only his errors, which yet survived in the minds of those who, not without scandal and danger to their souls, believed in him."<sup>1</sup> Probably in consequence of this work, Pope Paul IV. ordered an inquiry into Friar Jerome's works, and when the commissioners read to him some extracts, he exclaimed: "Why, this is Martin Luther!" But after the examination was finished, the only decision pronounced was a "suspension" of fifteen of the sermons and of the dialogue on *Prophetic Truth*. And in the *Index* of the Council of Trent these works are prohibited only "until corrected," which certainly implies that they contain only accidental, not essential, errors.

The sermons of Savonarola were placed upon the Roman Index "until corrected," but his other works are animated by a spirit of the most tender piety, and are thoroughly orthodox. His *Triumph of the Cross* consists of four books on the evidences of Christianity, and is written in a vein of calmness very surprising to one who has just been subjected to the fire of the author's sermons. His five books on the *Simplicity of the Christian Life* are preceded by an epistle to the citizens of Florence, in which he thus describes his work: "I shall try to adopt natural reason, rather than the authority of the divine writings. And I shall do so, because of the incredulous, the wise ones of this age, that is to say, the philosophers and orators, the poets and others of inflated intellect, who think that the Christian life is superstition, and that its simplicity is foolishness; also, because of the condition of our unhappy age, in which faith has grown so weak, and the supernatural light has been so nearly extinguished, that I am unable to decide whether those who acknowledge their belief merely regard it as an affair of opinion, and hold it because it was taught them in childhood, or whether they really cling to it as something taught by supernatural authority. I hesitate in pronouncing upon the faith of Christians of to-day, for charity has grown cold, and the fruit of

---

<sup>1</sup> Catarino had a perfect mania for scenting heresy nearly everywhere and in nearly every author. He even denounced to the Faculty of Paris many propositions of the great Thomas de Vio (called Cajetan, from his birthplace and See of Gaeta). But he was well rebuked by Bartholomew Spina, master of the apostolic palace, who, when Catarino was named to a bishopric, brought forth fifty propositions, taken from the zealot's writings, which, the critic insisted (though without reason), were heretical.



good works does not appear. But since the natural light does not fail in man, so long as he acts according to natural reason, let the intellect, at least, of these people be convinced, and let them understand that the Christian life is truth and simplicity; that it is not foolishness, but the wisdom of God; perhaps, then, they will cease to calumniate it. I trust, however, in the Lord Jesus, that you will find in this book nothing contrary to Holy Writ, or to the sayings of the holy Doctors, or to the teaching of the Holy Roman Church, to whose correction I have always submitted, and do submit; but that you will discover in it the full truth, which came down from heaven to our fathers who everywhere preached it, and left it to us in writing, confirmed by signs and miracles.”<sup>1</sup>

In this work Savonarola leads his reader to come, in each book, to a certain number of *Conclusions*. Thus, in the first book, the conclusions are as follows: The Christian life is that in which the doctrine of Christ is followed, and His conduct imitated. It is better than any other which can be found or excogitated. It is not founded in any natural love. Nor is it based on the sensitiveness of man. Neither is it founded on the sole natural light of reason. It proceeds from no natural cause. It proceeds from no spiritual creature. Its root and foundation is the grace of God. It tends, with all its powers, to augment and preserve the gift of grace. For these ends, prayer is a better means than any other good work. The devout and frequent use of the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist furnish the best means to preserve and to augment the gift of grace. The second book treats of simplicity of heart; the third, of exterior simplicity; the fourth, of rejection of superfluities, and of almsgiving; the fifth, of the happiness of the Christian life. The *Meditations* on the Psalms, *Miserere*, *In Te Domine speravi*, and *Qui regis Israel*, form, to use the words of the Dominican censor of the edition before us, “a honeyed book, full of the sweetness of piety, and it cannot be read without fruit if it is read attentively.” This book is peculiarly interesting from the fact that Savonarola composed it while in prison. The following touching prayer is prefixed to the meditation on the *Miserere*. “Unhappy me! I have offended heaven and earth, and am destitute of help. Where shall I go? To whom shall I turn? Who will have mercy on me? I dare not lift my eyes to heaven, for I have grievously offended heaven. I find no refuge on earth, for I have been a scandal to earth. What then shall I do? Shall I despair? God forbid! God is merciful, God is piteous, my Saviour is kind. God alone, then, is

---

<sup>1</sup> *Works of Friar Jerome Savonarola*; Grenoble, 1666, vol. ii.

my refuge; He will not despise His work; He will not spurn His image. To Thee, therefore, most kind God, I come, sad and dejected; Thou alone art my hope, my encouragement. But what shall I say to Thee, since I dare not raise my eyes? I must pour forth the words of contrition, and implore Thy pity, crying: *Misereere!*" Another interesting work of Savonarola's is a dialogue between the soul and a spirit, entitled *The Solace of My Journey*, the tone and object of which may be gathered from the first sentences: "*Spir.* I am now thinking of returning to my home, to see the God from whom I was banished; but thou shalt go with me, my spouse. *Soul.* But I know not the way to so great a joy. *Spir.* Our way is Christ. *Soul.* But faith wavers. *Spir.* He who approaches God, should believe that He is. *Soul.* And yet, he that is hasty to give credit, is light of heart (*Eccles.*, xix. 4). *Spir.* But to believe in God is the part of gravity and of wisdom. *Soul.* Has God ever spoken to thee? *Spir.* I believe those to whom He has deigned to speak. *Soul.* But how do you know that they heard God speaking? *Spir.* Miracles have proven it. *Soul.* Miracles have ceased; what then shall persuade me? *Spir.* Doubtest thou that God is? *Soul.* Many doubt, for no one has ever seen God (*John*, i. 18). *Spir.* But such have no intellect, according to the Psalmist (xiii. i.): 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.' *Soul.* How canst thou prove that God is? . . . . I admit the force of thy argument, but I ask, . . . . what is God? *Spir.* If carnal men could know what God is, He could not be God. For we can only know tangible and sensible things; God is not one of these, nor can He be presented to our intellects as He really is; it is sufficient that we know what He is not . . . . *Soul.* Thy words have convinced me, and I already yearn for the sight of God; but I ask myself, what if God does not grant it? Has He promised to thus bless those who love Him? *Spir.* Let what thou hast now learnt suffice for to-day. The night approaches; let us seek our abode in silence, and pray God that to-morrow thou mayest acquire more of the science of salvation." The first book of this Dialogue, as we have seen, treats of God; the second, of the truth of the faith; the third, of the Messiah, against the Jews; the fourth, of the articles of faith, against philosophers; the fifth, of the reasons of probability which favor the articles of faith; the sixth, of the future life; the seventh, of heaven.

We now ask the reader's attention to the following remarks of Cantù: "A man of faith, of superstition, of genius, Savonarola abounded in charity. Contrary to Luther, who confided entirely in reason, he believed in personal inspiration. From his works

may be taken arguments both for and against him; and by comparing them, we may perceive how he sought to harmonize reason with faith, the Catholic religion with political liberty. He never denied the authority of the Holy See, although he resisted him whom he regarded as an illegitimate Pope, and against whom he invoked a Council which should reform the Church. Vanity of applause and impatience of contradiction led him to excess, but he acted with a pure conscience and from no personal ambition. He did not try to propagate his ideas by force, but by example; that is, he believed in the power of truth . . . . He thought to guide the crowd by means of its passions, and, as always happens, he became the victim of these passions. He alone is a heretic who obstinately defends something contrary to what is defined to be of faith. The fame of Savonarola remained suspended between heaven and hell, but his end was deplored by all, and perhaps first by those who had caused it. In the churches of Santa Maria Novella and San Marco he is depicted as a saint, and Raphael placed him, in the *Loggie* of the Vatican, among the Doctors of the Church; portraits of him were kept and venerated, not only by the pious of Florence who continued to oppose corruption and its consequent slavery, but even by great saints . . . . It is said that Clement VIII. swore, in 1598, that if he succeeded in acquiring possession of Ferrara, he would canonize Savonarola. Serafino Razzi, a Dominican of Florence, and infatuated with Friar Jerome, often exhorted the Pontiff to this step, and when he saw the thing put off, he procured a little donkey, and, septuagenarian though he was, started, during the Jubilee, for Rome. But the Pope, 'fearing much opposition,' would not see him, and would not allow him to publish the *Life of Savonarola* that he had written; in vain had the Dominicans prepared an *office* for the friar.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Proper Office for Friar Jerome Savonarola and his companions, written in the 16th century, and now published for the first time, under the auspices of Count C. Capponi, with a Preface by Cæsar Guasti.* Prato, 1860. We subjoin three of the *Lessons* from this *Office*. "*Lesson vi.* When the work of preaching was confided to Jerome, having been instructed by divine revelation, he announced the future calamities of Italy and the coming renovation of the Church. While the king of France was menacing the Florentines, the man of God was sent to him to appease him by his prudence and his sanctity; he went to Pisa, and persuaded Charles VIII. Returning to Florence, he began to promulgate the divine will with an eloquence which hitherto he had not possessed, and with such effect that it seemed miraculous." "*Lesson vii.* His soul was often so united to God that his body become insensible to material things, was, as it were, dead. During the last ten years of his life he prepared none of his sermons before he had received the divine instructions as to what he should say. Who can describe his fluency of speech, the sublimity of his eloquence,



"If the philosophical Naudet called him a modern Arius or Mohammed, the devout Father Tournon thought him a messenger of God; Sts. Philip Neri and Catharine de Ricci venerated him as blessed, and Benedict XIV. deemed him worthy of canonization. *Not one of the followers of Friar Jerome became a disciple of Luther or a betrayer of his country's liberty.* Michael Angelo, who raised bastions for his native city and the greatest temple in Christendom, always venerated Savonarola. Machiavelli, who never embraced any opinions not in vogue, admired him at first; he commenced to ridicule him only when he himself had fully developed a policy that was diametrically opposite to that of the friar, namely, a policy without God, without Providence, without morality—an innate depravity, though without original sin and without a Redeemer—and which expected to regenerate Italy, not only without the Church, but in spite of the Church."

Much has been written for and against Savonarola's claims to the gift of prophecy. It is certain that very many wise and cool-headed men among his contemporaries credited his predictions; for instance, Pico della Mirandola, Marcilio Ficino, and St. Philip Neri. The reader may be interested in the following remarks of the prudent and observing Philip de Commynes: "I have already told how a Friar-Preacher, or Jacobin, a resident of Florence for fifteen years, and enjoying a reputation for great sanctity—whom I conversed with in 1495—Jerome by name, foretold many things which afterwards happened. He had always insisted that the king would cross the mountains, and he publicly declared that this and other things had been revealed to him by God. He said that the

---

the majesty of his expression? His voice was clear; his gesture animated; his countenance, not ardent, but really inflamed. Through him peace was made among citizens; the morals of men were so changed that they seemed to be other persons. The young, imbued with Christian simplicity, did nothing impure; in their pious zeal, they roused the indolent, penetrated into their houses, seized upon their vicious books and pictures, and burned them in the presence of the multitude." "*Lesson viii.* As his fame increased, just so did the number and ardor of his enemies. At length, a crowd attacked the convent of St. Mark, demanding the person of Jerome; but the gates were defended by the armed men surrounding the friar. Then the convent was assailed, Jerome kneeling at one of the altars, praying for friends and enemies. Fire opened a way for the besiegers, and they penetrated into the convent, destroying everything they met. The magistrates, informed of these excesses, took charge of Friars Jerome, Dominick and Sylvester. Jerome was imprisoned, and though twice subjected to the torture, refused to retract his predictions. Finally, the wicked man caused him and his two companions to be strangled and burnt; his ashes were thrown into the Arno, but his soul took up its abode in heaven." As late as August 20th, 1593, an archbishop of Florence, writing from Rome to the grand-duke Ferdinand I., complained of the recitation of this Office by the friars of St. Mark's, but he admitted that the recitation was private.

<sup>1</sup> *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse xi.

king had been chosen by God to reform the Church by force, and to chastise the tyrants (of Italy); and because he declared that he knew these future things by revelation, many murmured against him, and he acquired the hatred of the Pope and of many of the Florentines. His life was the most beautiful in the world, as every one could see, and his sermons against vice converted many in that city to a good life, as I have said. At this date of 1498, when King Charles died, Friar Jerome also passed away—four or five days intervening between the two deaths, and I will tell you why I note the date. He had always publicly preached that if the king did not return into Italy to accomplish the task God had assigned him, God would cruelly punish him; and all these sermons were printed and sold. And this same threat of cruel punishment had been often written to the king, before his death, by the said Jerome, as the friar himself told me in Italy, saying that the sentence of heaven was pronounced against the king, if he did not accomplish God's will, and did not restrain his soldiers from pillage. He predicted many true things concerning the king and the evils to befall him; the death of his son, and his own; and I have seen the letters to the king."<sup>1</sup> On May 13th, 1495, the Duke of Ferrara wrote to Manfredi, his agent at Florence, that he had understood that Friar Jerome "had said, and says, many things about the present affairs of Italy, and it appears that he threatens the Italian princes. And since he is a virtuous person and a good religious, we greatly wish to know what he has said and says, with all particulars; we desire you to see him, and to request him, in our name, to tell what he thinks is to happen, especially in matters concerning us." And Savonarola replied that he would pray to God, and then answer the duke. On August 8th, 1497, this same prince wrote to the friar: "We declare to you that we have never doubted the future occurrence of all the things you have predicted."

---

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, b. viii., c. 3.

---

## SCRIPTURE POETRY.

A GENERAL acquaintance with the artistic structure of the Hebrew poems is essential for an adequate understanding of the sacred text. Much discussed problems are, however, involved even in a superficial study of Scripture poetry. The rattling of ancient cymbals and kettle-drums, and the whole music band of savage nations, are still ringing in the ears of many as loudly as they rang in the ears of Herder's Alciphron. For them David still dances before the ark, and the prophets summon a player that they may feel his wild inspirations. Others expect to find in Hebrew poetry that beauty which they find in the odes of Horace and of Pindar. They imagine that there exists a series of rules of Hebrew prosody as may be found in our larger Latin and Greek grammars for the prosody of the classic languages. We shall not attempt to settle all doubts, and answer all arguments brought up by the advocates of either side, but shall endeavor to point out the results obtained through the serious investigations of the more eminent men of both parties.

Before entering upon the technical structure of Hebrew poetry, we must know the sacred poems that have come down to us. Besides the Psalms, the books of Job and of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles, we possess shorter poems in the song of Lamech to his two wives,<sup>1</sup> the blessing of Noah,<sup>2</sup> of Melchisedech,<sup>3</sup> of Rebecca's kinsfolk,<sup>4</sup> of Isaac,<sup>5</sup> of Jacob,<sup>6</sup> the song of Moses after crossing the Red Sea,<sup>7</sup> the victory song of Israel,<sup>8</sup> the triple blessing and prophecy of Balaam,<sup>9</sup> the swan-song of Moses,<sup>10</sup> his solemn blessing of all the tribes of Israel,<sup>11</sup> Deborah's song of victory,<sup>12</sup> the song of Anna, the mother of Samuel,<sup>13</sup> the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan,<sup>14</sup> David's thanksgiving for his delivery from the hands of all his enemies and from the hand of Saul,<sup>15</sup> his last words,<sup>16</sup> the canticles of Tobiah<sup>17</sup> and of Judith.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 4, 23, 24.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. 14, 19, 20.

<sup>5</sup> Gen. 27, 28, 29.

<sup>7</sup> Exod. 15, 1-18.

<sup>9</sup> Num. 23, 7, ff.

<sup>11</sup> Deut. 33, 2-29.

<sup>13</sup> 1 Kings, 2, 1-10.

<sup>15</sup> 2 Kings, 22, 2-51.

<sup>17</sup> Tob. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. 9, 25, 27.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. 24, 60.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. 49, 2-27.

<sup>8</sup> Num. 21, 27-30.

<sup>10</sup> Deut. 32, 1-43.

<sup>12</sup> Judg. 5, 2-32.

<sup>14</sup> 2 Kings, 1, 19-27.

<sup>16</sup> 2 Kings, 23, 2-7.

<sup>18</sup> Judg. 16, 2-21.



To these must be added several passages of the prophets, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, for instance, Isaiah 38, Jonah 2, Habakuk 3, probably Daniel 3, 52-90, and several others concerning which the learned have not yet agreed. The second book of Kings<sup>1</sup> speaks of "a Book of the Just," which is now lost; but from a short quotation of it, given in Jos. 10, 12, it appears to have been a poem. The third book of Kings<sup>2</sup> tells us that Solomon spoke three thousand parables, and composed a thousand and five poems, which also are lost to us. In the New Testament we meet three passages which might be termed poems: The Magnificat,<sup>3</sup> the Benedictus,<sup>4</sup> and the Nunc dimittis.<sup>5</sup> The spoken Hebrew text of these canticles not being preserved, it is impossible to determine whether their poetic structure is the same as that of the Old Testament poems.

All Scripture poems may be divided into two classes—lyrical and didactic. The Psalms are mainly lyrical, while the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are didactic and sententious. The book of Job and the Song of Solomon are treated in a rather dramatic way; De Wette Schrader,<sup>6</sup> Ewald,<sup>7</sup> Delitzsch,<sup>8</sup> and several others, especially among the Rationalists, maintain that Job and the Canticle of Canticles are dramas in the strict sense of the word. How the name drama, in its common acceptation, can apply to the two books in question we are not told by the learned upholders of their dramatic nature.

We have come now to a much discussed problem, the technical structure of Hebrew poetry. Many authors, discontent with the unsatisfactory and unconvincing arguments advanced for the different theories on the subject, assign but vague and meaningless characteristics to our sacred poems. Nordheimer<sup>9</sup> may serve as an instance of this. "The most important features," he says, "which distinguish Hebrew poetry from prose consist in the nature of its subjects, its mode of treating them, and the more ornate character of its style, which again give rise to peculiarities in the structure of sentences and in the choice of words." And again: "The sacred Hebrew muse, maintaining her primitive simplicity, lays down no arbitrary laws of versification with which to fetter the genius of the poet; she requires of her votary neither more nor less than that he should find himself in that state of excited and exalted feeling which is necessary to the production of all genu-

<sup>1</sup> 1, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Luc. 1, 46-55.

<sup>5</sup> Luc. 2, 29-32.

<sup>6</sup> Einleitung, p. 515.

<sup>8</sup> Commentar über das Buch Job, Leipz., 1876, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Hebrew Grammar, ii. 320.

<sup>2</sup> 4, 32.

<sup>4</sup> Luc. 1, 68-79.

<sup>7</sup> Die poetischen Bücher des A. T., ed. 2, p. 73 ff.

ine poetry, and should possess the power of delineating his emotions with truth and vigor." After dwelling, then, at some length on the universal features of poetic composition, he adds: "These primitive and fundamental characteristics of poetry in general, viz., a constant brevity of expression, and a reinforcing of the sentiments by means of repetition, comparison, and contrast, have ever remained the principal and almost the sole distinguishing features of the poetry of the ancient Hebrews. Accordingly the attention of modern investigators of the subject has been directed chiefly to ascertaining and classifying the different modes in which this mutual correspondence of sentences and clauses of sentences, termed parallelism, is exhibited in every species of poetical composition." Parallelism, therefore, without any arbitrary laws of versification to fetter the genius of the poet, is, according to Dr. Nordheimer, the distinguishing feature of Hebrew poetry.

After the clear and learned investigations of Lowth,<sup>1</sup> the different kinds of parallelism are fully ascertained and classified. Synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic parallelisms are its principal divisions. Synonymous parallelism consists in the repetition of an idea in nearly the same, or in different words, in a positive or a negative clause, in every second or every third line; in the last case, when, namely, the first clause answers to the third, and the second to the fourth, or when the first and second clauses correspond with the third and fourth, the parallelism is said to be doubled. Instances are common; Psalm 103, 1-4 may serve to illustrate simple parallelisms:

1. { When Israel went out of Egypt,  
The house of Jacob from a barbarous people,
2. { Judea was made his sanctuary,  
Israel his dominion.
3. { The sea saw and fled:  
Jordan was turned back.
3. { The mountains skipped like rams,  
And the hills like the lambs of the flock.

Further explanation is hardly needed; Israel and the house of Jacob, Egypt and a barbarous people, the sea and the Jordan, the mountains and the hills, lambs and the rams of the flock, are brought into opposition. An instance of double synonymous parallelism we find in Psalm 26, 1-3:

1. The Lord is my light and my salvation,
2. Whom shall I fear?
3. The Lord is the protection of my life:
4. Of whom shall I be afraid?

<sup>1</sup> De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones, 1753 et 1763. There is an English translation of this valuable work by Gregory, with notes by the translator, from Michaelis and others, London, 1787.

1. If enemies in camp should stand against me,
2. My heart shall not fear.
3. If a battle should rise against me.
4. In this will I be comforted.

Here we notice the mutual correspondence of the first and third, the second and fourth lines, constituting what is named double parallelism. We find at times three, four, or even more lines in the required mutual correspondence, *e.g.*, Psalm 90, 5, 6.

Thou shalt not be afraid of the terror of the night,  
Of the arrow that flieth in the day,  
Of the business that walketh about in the dark,  
Of invasion, or of noon-day devil.

Antithetic parallelism consists in such a mutual relation of the clauses or sentences that the second is the converse of the first. The Book of Proverbs 11, 1 ff. may serve as an instance of this kind of poetry:

1. { A deceitful balance is an abomination before God;  
And a just weight is his will,
2. { Where pride is, there also shall be reproach,  
But where humility is, there also is wisdom.
3. { The simplicity of the just shall guide them,  
And the deceitfulness of the wicked shall destroy them.
4. { Riches shall not profit in the day of revenge;  
But justice shall deliver from death.

What could be more striking than the opposition between the deceitful balance and the just weight, between the abomination before the Lord and the will of God, between pride and humility, reproach and wisdom? The strong contrast between lines of this kind of parallelism makes the thought very clear and impressive, provided it be not continued too long.

In synthetic or progressive parallelism the inspired writer, keeping his main idea always in view, develops and enforces it by accessory ideas and modifications. The praise of the law of God, as read in Psalm 18, 8-10, is a striking example:

The law of the Lord is unspotted—converting souls;  
The testimony of the Lord is faithful—giving wisdom to little ones.  
The justices of the Lord are right—rejoicing hearts;  
The commandment of the Lord is lightsome—enlightening the eyes.  
The fear of the Lord is holy—enduring for ever and ever;  
The judgments of the Lord are true—justified in themselves.

The whole passage intends to praise and celebrate God's law; but this main idea is brought home to the reader and enforced by the accessory idea of the divine justice and the fear of God, and



by the diverse beneficent effects of God's commandments on the soul of man.

If this kind of parallelism is used to a great length, without being interrupted by either of the two kinds of lines above mentioned, it is hardly distinguishable from good prose. Hence, examples of poetry in which two, or even all three kinds of parallelism intermingle, are by far the more numerous. The words of God, in which He mapped out the mission of Isaiah the prophet, illustrate this principle of mixed parallelism, as they illustrate many another principle of both ascetic and psychological life. We read, Isaiah 6, 8 f., "And I heard the voice of the Lord, saying: whom shall I send? and who shall go for us? and I said: Lo, here am I, send me. And he said: Go, and thou shalt say to this people:

		Hearing hear and understand not:
		And see the vision and know it not,
1	1	Blind the heart of this people,
2	2	And make their ears heavy,
3	3	And shut their eyes:
3	4	Lest they see with their eyes,
2	5	And hear with their ears,
1	6	And understand with their hearts,
	7	And be converted, and I heal them."

The first two verses are, at the same time, progressive and anti-thetic; the six lines that follow present a beautiful example of introverted mixed parallelism. In the first three lines, as well as in the second three, the ideas are progressive, while synonymous correspondence is had between the third and fourth, the second and fifth, and the first and sixth lines. The seventh line expresses the one main thought which God wished to convey, and for whose emphasis He made use of all the intermediate accessory ideas. The piece, taken as a whole, is therefore synthetic.

From the very nature of parallelism, it is clear that Hebrew poetry is, to a great extent, divisible into couplets and triplets; and these may be called its natural stanzas. A perfect instance of couplets we find in the fifth chapter of Lamentations, while the first, second, and third chapters of Lamentations are written in triplets; a glance at the Hebrew text of the Old Testament will verify this. In most inversions the beauties of the original poetic structure are destroyed by the introduction of paraphrases, or by a double rendering of the same clause, or by a wrong division of verses, stanzas, and even chapters. In one case, we may obtain an idea of the original from the English version:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lam. I, 1 f.

1. How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people!  
How is the mistress of the Gentiles become a widow :  
The princes of provinces made tributary.
2. Weeping she hath wept in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks :  
There is none to comfort her among all them that were dear to her :  
All her friends have despised her and are become her enemies.

We might continue quoting the first three chapters of Lamentations, dividing each verse into triplets of synonymous, synthetic, or antithetic lines. Lamentations 5 may, as was said above, be divided into couplets of such parallel sentences:

1. Remember, O Lord, what is come upon us :  
Consider and behold our reproach.
2. Our inheritance is turned to aliens :  
Our houses to strangers, etc.

Often, several parallel lines are thrown into one stanza, though Hebrew stanzas do not seem to have obeyed as strict metrical laws as do the stanzas of Latin and Greek poets. But this being as yet uncertain, we shall have to speak of it again when treating of the more recent views on Hebrew metre. That the inspired writers purposely divided some of their pieces into such longer and more artificial stanzas is plain from certain refrains occurring at regular intervals in several Hebrew poems. Thus we find, in Psalms 41 and 42, which constitute properly only one psalm, the refrain: "Why art thou sad, O my soul? and why dost thou trouble me? Hope in God, for I will give praise to him: the salvation of my countenance and my God," repeated three times, namely, Psalm 41, 6 and 12, and Psalm 42, 6, five verses intervening between the three several repetitions, and constituting as many regular stanzas. In the same manner is Psalm 45 divided into three, and Psalm 56 into two stanzas.

Another sign of artistic design in the building up of stanzas in Hebrew poems may be seen in the alphabetical arrangement of several of them. Its simplest form consists in making the initial words of the first lines begin with the letters of the alphabet in regular order. This is the case in Psalms 111 and 112, Psalms 9, 25, 34, etc.; Lam. 4, Proverbs 31, 10-31, are also alphabetical, but in such a way that every distich or tristich begins with a different letter. In some cases, the third chapter of Lamentations, for instance, the first letter begins the initial words of the first three verses, the second letter the initial words of the second three verses, continuing thus in regular alphabetical order. Psalm 118 is still more remarkable, because each letter in succession commences eight verses, indicating that each stanza of the psalm comprises eight verses. The peculiarity of the alphabetic poetry of Sacred

Scripture cannot be exhibited in a literal version, but the translators have tried in several instances, as in Psalm 118 and Lamentations 1, 2, 3, 4, to compensate the reader by prefixing the names of the Hebrew letters in alphabetical succession to their corresponding stanzas or verses. Prof. Bickell<sup>1</sup> enumerates fifteen sacred poems of the Old Testament in which the alphabetical arrangement is observed. Whether, beyond indicating the proper division into verses and stanzas, this structure had any meaning, cannot now be determined. Some think it was employed to strike the ear and thus to deepen the impression; others represent it as a mere aid of the memory. Prof. Bickell suggests that it indicated the exhaustive treatment of a subject.

We must conclude, therefore, that our sacred writers often intentionally and artistically joined their parallel doublets and triplets into more lengthy stanzas, even where they are not expressly indicated by references or by alphabetical arrangement. It is not difficult to see that in Psalms 3, 4, etc., two distichs are united into one stanza; in Psalms 91, 112, etc., three; in Psalms 120, 121, etc., four; in Psalms 131, etc., five; and in Psalms 96, etc., six. All Hebrew poetry being subject to the law of parallelism, as we saw above, it may happen that stanzas are formed without regard to the number of lines, but merely according to the number of parallel verses. In Psalm 2, *e.g.*, we have four stanzas consisting of three verses each, though the number of lines be seven, six, eight, eight, respectively. In some psalms there is a seeming redundancy of verses. Psalm 6, for instance, consists of four stanzas, preceded and followed by a single verse; but the preceding single verse<sup>2</sup> contains the subject matter of the following three stanzas, while the last stanza prepares the way for the closing verse. In Psalm 13, too, whose third verse according to the Vulgate reading is taken from other psalms and prophecies, we may distinguish four stanzas followed by a single closing verse which comprises the burden of the whole psalm.

Thus far we have considered peculiarities of Hebrew poetry concerning the substance of which there is but little or no doubt. As we advance now, we shall find ourselves travelling more uncertain roads. All admit the existence of Biblical poems; all admit, too, that in poetry we naturally and necessarily require rhythm. The question then arises: In what does Hebrew rhythm consist? Rhythm<sup>3</sup> according to its primary meaning signifies number, but number necessarily supposes a unit numbered. In rhythmical language, then, we must look for the unit, the repetition and num-

<sup>1</sup> Innsbruck Theol. Zeitsch., 1882, p. 320.

<sup>2</sup> 6, 2.

<sup>3</sup> ῥυθμός, *numeus*.



ber of which produces what is called rhythm. This unit may be either an idea or it may be a sound. If it is an idea, we obtain the parallelism which thus far we have been considering. It may not be out of place here to draw attention to the fact that rhythm of ideas produces a more universal beauty than can be obtained by rhythm of sound, for ideas remain identical, whether the poem be translated or not, while sound changes, and the sound unit once destroyed, rhythm, of course, vanishes. It becomes clear from this why, even in the versions of the Scriptural poems, there is found so much poetic beauty, for it owes its existence to the rhythm of ideas or to parallelism. On the other hand, every one acquainted with the original of our sacred poems knows that they possess, in Hebrew, a charm which is entirely missing in the versions. This cannot be the result of parallelism, since the ideas are the same in version and original; nor can it result from a special clearness and force of language in the original, our versions being commonly much more easily understood than the Hebrew text. Therefore we rightly look in Hebrew poetry for rhythm of sound besides the rhythm of ideas. This conclusion, reached by a process of elimination, we might have drawn from two general principles of Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> that, namely, everything without rhythm (number) is unlimited, and that everything unlimited is hard to know and unpleasant. The original of sacred poetry, even apart from the ideas, not being unpleasant, we necessarily seek for sound-rhythm in it, if Aristotle's principles be right.

Our last conclusion was, that in the Hebrew text of Sacred poetry there exists a certain sound-rhythm; consequently there is a sound-unit, from the repetition of which we have rhythm. What can be this sound-unit? Articulate sound may be considered merely as an articulate-unit, or it may be measured by the time required to pronounce it, or it may be classified according to the relative intensity with which it is pronounced, or, finally, it may be considered according to the vocal elements entering its composition. The articulated unit or syllable, the length or quantity of the syllable, its relative intensity or accent, and, finally, its component vocal elements, afford as many possible units of sound-rhythm. French poetry, for instance, counts the number of syllables; Latin and Greek poetry takes into account the quantity of the syllable; the German and Slavonic poets are guided by the syllabic accent; while the unit of similar vocal composition of the syllable, or rhyme, is used as an additional rhythmical emphasis in many languages.

One more remark we must premise: Rhythm must not be con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rhetor. b, 3, c. 8.

founded with metre. All metre is, indeed, rhythmical, but not all rhythm is metre. Venerable Bede in his book, *De Metris*, following in the footsteps of S. Augustine,<sup>1</sup> tells us that metre is "ratio cum modulatione," while he defines rhythm, "modulatio sine ratione." The whole passage may be found in Vossius.<sup>2</sup> Rhythm, therefore, in its wide sense does not require an absolutely equal number of units, but it is content with a relatively proportionate number. Rhythm of proportion is required even in prose, as Aristotle asserts in the above quoted chapter. We must determine, therefore, in the first place, whether rhythm of sound, merely in its wide sense, occurs in Sacred Scripture, or whether we also find there metre in the proper sense of the word; and, if metre proper exists in Sacred Scripture, what is the sound-unit of its rhythm?

Omitting all probable *a priori* arguments in favor of the existence of metre, properly so-called, in our sacred poems, arguments to be found in Vossius<sup>3</sup> where he discusses Aristotle's view of poetry and its essential constituent parts, we may at once proceed to enumerate facts, from which the existence of Hebrew metre in its strict acceptation follows with great probability. Such facts are: The existence of metre proper in several cognate Semitic languages, the psychological necessity of metre in song accompanied by dancing, the division of many sacred poems into regular stanzas, the directions given in Holy Writ itself that certain psalms are to be chanted after the melody of others, which seems quite meaningless if mere cantillation were in question. We must add the testimony of St. Jerome, who speaks of heroic verse, hexameters, trimeters, and tetrameters, when treating of Sacred poetry.<sup>4</sup> He even compares the Psalms to the iambic and alcaic verses of Horace and Pindar, and tells us that Psalm 118 and the long Mosaic poems are written in hexameters of sixteen syllables to the line. Flav. Josephus<sup>5</sup> maintains that the songs of Moses, in Exodus 15 and Deut. 33, are written in hexameter verse, the Psalms in trimeter and pentameter. Here is the place to state the reasoning of Dr. J. Ecker of Münster<sup>6</sup> against Dr. Bickell's system of Hebrew metre, which, in reality, is valid against the existence of any kind of metre in sacred poetry. If metre ever existed, how could its knowledge be lost, since the poems were of almost daily use in temple and synagogue? Professor Bickell answered

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iii, de Musica.

<sup>2</sup> Tom. v, inst. poet. l. 1, c. 8, § 12.

<sup>3</sup> Tom. 5, de arr. poet. natura ce. 2 et 3.

<sup>4</sup> F. Praep. Evang. xi, 5 (M. 21, 852)—Praef. in lib. Job; ad Paulam ep. 30, 3 (M. 22, 442)—Praef. in Euseb, Chron. (M. 27, 223).

<sup>5</sup> Antiq. ii. 16, 4; iv. 8, 44; vii. 12, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Literarischer Handweiser, N. 320, September, 1882.

the objection<sup>1</sup> by citing a similar instance. The syllabic, rhythmic, and strophic structure of the Greek Church hymns had been entirely forgotten by the Greeks themselves, though the hymns had continued in daily liturgical use. Cardinal Pitra was the first to rediscover the metrical nature of the hymns. The learned Professor observes that such a forgetfulness must have been much easier among the Hebrews, psalmody proper ceasing with the destruction of the temple, and being replaced later by the mere recital of psalms in the synagogues. We must also call attention to the fact that not all Hebrew poems were songs, many of them belonging to didactic poetry.

The probable existence of regular metre in our sacred poems being taken for granted, we may proceed to consider the different metrical systems proposed at various times as the true keys to Hebrew poetry. The view, that in some Hebrew poems rhyme was intended, may be passed over in silence, since real rhyme occurs so rarely that its occurrence is more easily explained by chance than by any rule of art. Those taking interest in this peculiarity may find instances of it in Ps. 8, 5; Is. 33, 22; Judg. 14, 8; Gen. 4, 23 f.; Numb. 10, 35, etc. Instances of alliteration are more frequent. Dr. Julius Ley, of Halle, proposed, in 1863, alliteration as the general system of Hebrew poetry, but being left alone in his theory, he himself abandoned it and became the advocate of a more satisfactory system.

The vocal elements of the syllable cannot, therefore, be considered as the true unit of Hebrew sound-rhythm. Nor were the remaining three elements of sound, the syllable, its accent, its quantity, which we recognized above as possible units of sound-rhythm, left untried. Since Josephus, Eusebius, Philo, and St. Jerome had asserted that in sacred poetry the verses and feet corresponded to the feet and verses of classic poetry, attempts were made to scan the Psalms accordingly. In 1637 appeared at Lyons the "*Lyre of David*," by Fr. Gomar. The learned author finds in the Psalms instances parallel to certain portions of Sophocles and Pindar. Lud. Capellus, in his "*Critica Sacra*," proved this theory to be untenable. The same system was proposed by C. G. Anton,<sup>2</sup> and of late by A. F. Manoury.<sup>3</sup> William Jones<sup>4</sup> modified the system a little according to the canons of Arabic instead of classic poetry. All closed syllables, *i.e.*, syllables ending in a consonant, he considers as long, all open syllables, *i.e.*, syllables ending in vowels, as short. He admits the spondee, the iambus,

<sup>1</sup> Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, Innsbruck, 1882, iv., 789.

<sup>2</sup> Conjectura de metro Hebraeorum antiquo, Lips., 1770.

<sup>3</sup> Lettre sur la versification Hebraïque, Bar le Duc, 1880.

<sup>4</sup> Poeseos Asiaticae Commentarius, London, 1774.



the trochee, the pyrrichius, the anapest, the bacchius, the amphimacer and the molossus, as possible single feet, which he then joins in all possible ways into compound feet. After scanning six or eight lines he consoles us with the assurance that he supposes Job 28, the Lament., the songs of Moses, and Deborah, also might be scanned in the same fashion. We cannot but smile at the candor of W. Jones, when he admits not to be able to do justice to this subject without spending an infinite amount of labor and time at it, which he says he cannot spare. Expressing his satisfaction with himself for having opened a new road to the true beauty of Hebrew poetry, he leaves to us all the infinite labor required to reach that beauty.

It seems, then, that besides the vocal composition of the syllable, we must discard also syllabic-quantity as the possible unit of Hebrew sound-rhythm. Next follow the attempts to scan the Scripture poems according to accent, or the relative stress of the syllable. That the written Massoretic accent cannot be taken as the leading principle of Hebrew versification, is evident. If it were, it should have been introduced from the beginning, while it dates from several centuries after Christ; it should be of the same nature in all poetic pieces, while one system of accentuation is followed in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, another in the rest of sacred poetry; finally, in the different editions of the same poetic passages, *e.g.*, Psalm 17 and 2 Kings, 22, 2, Psalms 13 and 52, etc., we should find the same accents, which is not the case. The fruitless attempts of E. J. Greve,<sup>1</sup> and of I. A. Bellermann<sup>2</sup> to scan sacred poetry according to accent, may be seen in Rosenmüller.<sup>3</sup> Dr. J. Ley, of Halle, proposed in 1875<sup>4</sup> the system of applying to Hebrew poetry the canons of the old German versification—to count, namely, the number of accented syllables in the line, allowing any number of unaccented syllables to intervene between the single accents. We may accent a given word or not, according to the needs of the metre; in case of necessity, we may admit even a double accent on the same word. When verses are too short, they are called catalectic; and when too long, an anacrusis-accent<sup>5</sup> is not counted. With all these licenses, the divisions of the verse cannot be brought into harmony with the divisions of the sense. At times, most closely connected words must be separated, even single words split, in order to construct verses and stanzas. Dr. Neteler<sup>6</sup> had

<sup>1</sup> Ultima capita I. Jobi—accedit tractatus de metris Heb. poeticis, Davent., 1788.

<sup>2</sup> Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer., Berlin, 1813.

<sup>3</sup> In Lowth de sacra poesi Heb., Lips., 1815, p. 434 f.

<sup>4</sup> Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers und Strophenbaues in der Hebräischen Poesie.

<sup>5</sup> Auftact.      <sup>6</sup> Anfang der Hebräischen Metrik der Psalmen, Münster, 1871.

tried the same theory without allowing as many poetic licenses, and with a correspondingly less amount of success.

Ch. A. Briggs, Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York, began a series of articles on Hebrew metre in the April number of *Hebraica*, 1886. His theory may be summed up in the following words, taken from his first article: "Hebrew poetry . . . counts the words and measures by the beats of the accent . . . . Maqqeph must be inserted wherever the rhythm requires it, for this is a device whereby two or more words are combined under one rhythmical accent." Professor Briggs measures his lines, therefore, according to accent; he admits only one accent in a given word. But, if the metre requires it, he unites two or more words into one by means of Maqqeph, avoiding thus the inconvenience of wholly unaccented words. To avoid double accents on the same word he omits existing Maqqeph, thus splitting compound words into their component simple ones. These changes of the Massoretic text presupposed, he proceeds to illustrate his system by scanning instances of Hebrew trimeter, tetrameter, pentameter, etc. The system, therefore, does not differ from that of Drs. Neteler and Ley, excepting that it introduces an arbitrary Maqqeph instead of an arbitrary accent.

The weakness of Ley's system was shown in the *Lit. Centralblatt*<sup>1</sup> in a criticism coming probably from the pen of Dr. Merx, of Jena. The critic proves that not the Massoretic verse but the hemistich is to be considered as poetical unit of the stanza; that the verse division ought to coincide with the division of sense, and that syllables ought to be counted instead of accents. Applying these principles to the Book of Job,<sup>2</sup> he advanced the study of Hebrew metre more than it had advanced for over a century before him. But his system, too, has its weak sides. It disregards all accent, and it requires only an approximately equal number of syllables in the corresponding hemistichs; for the inequality of syllables, in the author's view, was counterbalanced by the melody of song.

We see that, in the systems thus far considered, the vocal composition of the syllable, its quantity, its accent, the syllable itself, are severally looked upon as units of sound-rhythm, and that the result is not satisfactory; either because the sacred poems cannot be scanned according to the proposed systems, or because the systems allow too many licenses to satisfy an honest inquirer. Well, then, might thorough students follow a hint of Gregorius Bar Hebraeus,<sup>3</sup> informing us that other Syriac doctors, Isaac, namely, and

<sup>1</sup> 1876, n. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Gedicht von Hiob, Jena, 1871.

<sup>3</sup> Ethic, par. i. cp. 5, sect. 4, as quoted in Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. i. cp. 8.

Balai, composed several songs according to the Davidic verse, or the verse of the Psalms. From the technical structure of the poems of Isaac and Balai, therefore, we may learn the technical structure of the Psalms, and consequently of all other sacred poems. The Syriac poems were pointed out in another way as the key to the Hebrew poems. Cardinal Pitra<sup>1</sup> rediscovered the metre of the sacred Greek hymns by applying the metrical canons of the Syriac Madrosche in their scanning, and these in turn he supposes to have been modeled on Hebrew psalmody. Their close similarity to the therapeutic songs, as described by Philo, was the basis of Pitra's supposition.

The canons of Syriac metre are to be found in the introduction of Bickell's "*Sti. Ephraemi Carmina Nisibena.*"<sup>2</sup> Without entering into technical details, it suffices for our purpose to know that Syriac verse disregards quantity, and counts the number of syllables, every second of which is accented, the metrical accident coinciding with the verbal. Hence we find only iambic and trochaic feet in Syriac verse. Vowels are sometimes rejected, sometimes inserted, sometimes contracted. Prof. Bickell proceeded next to apply these canons to sacred song, and succeeded beyond all expectation. He published, or rather announced, his theory in the "*Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitschrift*,"<sup>3</sup> explained it more fully in his "*Metrices Biblicae Regulae*,"<sup>4</sup> extended it to all poetical passages of the Old Testament in his "*Carmina V. T. metricæ*,"<sup>5</sup> which he afterwards supplemented at various times in the "*Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitschrift*."<sup>6</sup> G. Gietmann, S. J., in his "*De re metrica Hebraeorum*,"<sup>7</sup> follows the same system of scanning, though he differs in details from Bickell. The system is adopted as the true one by men like A. Rohling,<sup>8</sup> H. Lesêtre,<sup>9</sup> J. Knabenbauer, S. J.,<sup>10</sup> F. Vigouroux,<sup>11</sup> and others of no ordinary reputation. Nor can Bickell's system be called new, for, besides Bar Hebraeus, who spoke of it as of a thing beyond dispute, Fr. Hare<sup>12</sup> had proposed the same system, at least in substance. He admitted only dissyllabic feet, made no account of syllabic quantity, and accepted only the iambic and trochaic movement like Bickell; unlike Bickell, but like Gietmann, he did not require that the end of the metrical line

<sup>1</sup> *Hymnographie de l'Église Grecque*, Rome, 1868.

<sup>2</sup> Leipzig, 1866, pp. 31-35.

<sup>4</sup> Geniponte, 1879.

<sup>6</sup> 1885, p. 718 ff.; 1866, pp. 205 ff, 355 ff, 546 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Das Salomonische Spruchbuch, Mainz, 1879, p. 24 and 385 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Le Livre des Psaumes, Paris, 1883, p. 23 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Commentar. in lib. Job, Parisiis, 1885, p. 18.

<sup>12</sup> Psalmorum liber in versiculos metricæ divisus, Cum dissertatione de antiqua Hebraeorum poesi, London, 1736.

<sup>3</sup> 1878, pp. 791 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Geniponte, 1882.

<sup>7</sup> Friburgi, 1880.

<sup>11</sup> Manuel bibl. ii. p. 203 ff.



should coincide with the division of the sense. Lowth,<sup>1</sup> in his matter-of-fact criticism, felt bound to reject Hare's system entirely, and ever after it was "to dumb forgetfulness a prey." The posthumous work of Le Hir<sup>2</sup> presents, in the essay preceding the translation of Job, a system of scanning almost identical with the system now under consideration. Had the modest priest of Saint-Sulpice lived he would, no doubt, have succeeded in explaining all our sacred poetry accordingly.

The historical outlines of this system being clear, we may proceed to illustrate it by a few instances taken more or less at random from Prof. Bickell's work. We shall give the transliterated Hebrew text, only remarking that the consonants are pronounced as in English, the pronunciation of the vowels being like the continental European pronunciation:

## PSALM 150.

Hallélu él bekódsho—Praise ye the Lord in his holy place:  
 Hallúhu bírki 'úzzo—Praise ye him in the firmament of his power.  
 Hallúhu big'buróthar—Praise ye him for his mighty deeds:  
 Hallúhu K'róbguðléhu—Praise ye him according to the multitude of his greatness.  
 Hallúhu b'théka' shórar—Praise ye him with sound of trumpet:  
 Hallúhu b'nébel v'kinnor—Praise ye him with psaltery and harp.  
 Hallúhu b'thof umáchol—Praise ye him with timbrel and choir:  
 Hallúhu b'mínnim v'úggab—Praise ye him with strings and organ.  
 Hallúhu b'zilz'le sháma'—Praise ye him on high sounding cymbals:  
 Hallúhu b'zilz'le th'rua'—Praise ye him on cymbals of joy.  
 Kol hánn'shamá t'hallél yah—Let every spirit praise the Lord.

We notice, at once, that each Hebrew line consists of seven syllables, and that the feet are of the iambic movement. The psalm is, therefore, rightly called iambic heptasyllabic. Wherever a little accent, curved from right to left, is placed between two vowelless consonants, the intervening vowel of the Massoretic text is suppressed, a perfectly allowable process according to the canons of Syriac metre. In the scanning of the Psalms, Bickell found it necessary to reject in this way about 1600 vowels; he had to omit, also, 1550 syllables of the common Massoretic reading, and to add about 1070.<sup>3</sup> We must, however, remember that in many of these instances the change is owing to the fact that two grammatical forms express the same relation. Thus, *ô* is often exchanged with *éhû*, both being the pronomial affix of the third person, masculine, singular. The biblical parallel passages, too, serve to lessen the shock we experience at first hearing of so many changes. The 17th Psalm, for instance, though a mere repetition

<sup>1</sup> De sacra poesi Heb., Lips. 1815, p. 403 and p. 699 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Le livre de Job, Paris, 1873.

<sup>3</sup> Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitch., 1882, p. 789 ff.

of 2 Kings, 22, changes 76 words, omits 19, adds 15, transposes 1, and transposes, also, a line. Bickell, in scanning Psalms 33, 34 and 76, changes only 6 and omits 6 words; in Psalm 78, 1-50 (a), he changes 4, omits 13, and adds 3 words; in Psalms 105 and 26 he changes 3, omits 12, and adds 5 words; in Psalms 147-150, and 24, 7-10, he changes 4, omits 4, and adds 5 words; in Deut. 32, 1-35, he changes 5 and omits 2 words, and transposes a line; in Job 38, 2-39 and 15, he changes 5, omits 3, adds 4, and transposes 1 word; in Proverbs 10, 1-11 and 23, he changes 2 and omits 1 word. It must be remembered that each of these seven instances is exactly equal to Psalm 17 and 2 Kings 22, *i.e.*, consists of 112 heptasyllabic lines, and that proposed emendations which do not influence the metre must not be brought as arguments against the metrical system in question. On the whole, then, not one-ninth of the number of changes found in the cited parallel passages of the Bible is required to render possible an exact scanning of the sacred poems according to the rules of Syriac metre.

Setting aside, therefore, all anxiety for the integrity of our sacred text, we may consider a few more instances, illustrating the same metrical principles. Psalm 18, 8-15, presents a beautiful example of compound metre. Each stanza consists of four iambic verses, the first and third of which are heptasyllabic, the second and fourth quadrisyllabic:

1. Toráth yahvéh temíma  
Meshí bath náp'sh  
'Edúth yahvéh ne'mána  
Machkímáth p'thí
2. Piqqúde yáhveh y'shárim  
Mesámm'che léb,  
Mizváth yahveh berúéa  
M'iráth 'enáim.

1. The law of God is holy,  
Converting souls;  
The word of God is faithful,  
Instructing fools.
2. God's justices are righteous,  
Rejoicing hearts.  
The law of God is lightsome,  
Enlightening eyes.

It may be interesting to know that the Syriac poet Cyrillonas has employed the same metre and stanza.

In the last place, we add a specimen of a more artificially constructed stanza found in Psalm 5. Each stanza consists of six iambic lines, the first, fourth, and fifth being heptasyllabic, the second quadrisyllabic, the third hendecasyllabic, the sixth euneasyllabic. The Psalm reads:

1. 'Marái ha'zína, yáhveh  
Biná h'gígí.  
Haqshíba l'qól shaví', malkí  
velóhai;  
Kí éthpallél elécha.  
Yahvéh, boq'r tishma 'qóli;  
Boq'r éroch lécha váázappe.

- 1 Give ear, O Lord, to my words,  
And hear my cry.  
My king and God! O, hear the voice  
of prayer,  
My prayer to thee ascending.  
My morning prayer hear thou,  
At morning, when I stand before thee.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>2. Ki lô el cháphez rásh<sup>o</sup>ta;<br/>         Lo y'gúrcha rá'.<br/>         Lo yithyazz'bù hol'lím lenág'd<br/>         'enécha;<br/>         Sanéthá kol po<sup>o</sup>lé av'n.<br/>         Teábbed dóbre cházab;<br/>         Ish dámim v'emírma y'thá'eb yáhveh.</p> | <p>2. Thou art not God of evil,<br/>         Sin is not thine.<br/>         And sinners shall not dwell before<br/>         present;<br/>         Thou hatest the ungodly,<br/>         Destroyest all deceivers.<br/>         God hates the cruel and deceitful.</p> |
|--|---|

Stanzas like these invariably remind one of the strophes and antistrophes of Greek choruses.

We must not imagine, however, that all difficulties have been successfully overcome. The many changes of the Massoretic text necessary to scan the sacred poems according to the principles of verse just indicated, is in itself a serious stumbling-block, opposing the progress of the new system; the difficulty increases when a change of sense is necessary that influences the dogmatic value of a passage. If the words of Psalm 44, 7, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," from which St. Paul<sup>1</sup> draws an argument for the divinity of Christ, have to be changed to "the foundation of thy throne is firm; the Lord hath strengthened it forever and ever," as Prof. Bickell changes them, the new system destroys St. Paul's argument, and must, therefore, be abandoned. Nor can we approve of the plan of Father Gietmann,<sup>2</sup> who allows fewer changes of the Massoretic text, but does not insist on the verse divisions coinciding with the sense divisions. Parallelism would thus be destroyed. If, then, the canons of Syriac metre really are the laws of Hebrew verse, there must be a way of applying them without injuring either the dogmatic value of the sacred text or its beautiful parallelism. Let us hope that Professor Bickell may soon be able to analyze all Scripture poems, avoiding both inconveniences. Meanwhile we must be grateful to the special students of this branch for the light they have thrown on both sense and beauty of the inspired writers by their untiring endeavors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Heb. I, 8.

<sup>2</sup> De re metrica Heb., Friburgi, 1880.



## LULWORTH CHAPEL, BISHOP CARROLL AND BISHOP WALMESLEY.

- Records of the English Province S.J.* By Henry Foley, S.J.  
*English Catholic Hierarchy.* By W. Maziere Brady. Rome. 1877.  
*Life of Bishop Milner.* By Provost Husenbeth. Dublin. 1862.  
*History of the Church in England.* By Canon Flanagan. London. 1857.  
*Historical Memoirs.* By Charles Butler, Esq. 2d ed. London. 1819.  
*Supplementary Memoirs.* By Dr. Milner. London. 1820.  
*Collections, etc.* By V. Rev. George Oliver, D.D. London. 1857.  
*Collectanea S.J.* Exeter. 1838.  
*Archdiocesan Archives.* Baltimore.  
*Catholic Directory.* London. 1802.  
*The Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll.* By Dr. John G. Shea. New York. 1888.  
*History of the Royal Society.* By C. R. Weld, London, 1837.

IN St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, is preserved a Latin document, endorsed "Certificate of Consecration at Lulworth Castle of J. Bp. of Balt<sup>re</sup>, August 15th, 1790."<sup>1</sup> This year will witness the first centenary of the erection of the metropolitan See of the United States. To the many who are interested in the early days of the American Church, a translation of this document, together with some details illustrative of the memorable scene of which it is the simple record, will, we hope, be not unwelcome.

Done into English, the certificate is, substantially, as follows:

"By these presents we testify that, assisted by the Reverend Charles Plowden and the Reverend James Porter, priests, we did, in the chapel of Lulworth Castle, Dorsetshire, England, on Aug. 15th, 1790, the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, confer Episcopal consecration upon the Reverend John Carroll, Bishop-elect of Baltimore, the Apostolic Letter, given under the seal of the Fisherman at St. Mary Major's, November 6th, 1789, having been read, and the oath having been taken by the Prelate-elect, according to the Roman Pontifical.

Given at Lulworth, August 17th, 1790.

† CHARLES WALMESLEY, Bp. of Rama, V.A.,  
 † CHARLES PLOWDEN, Assistant-priest,  
 † JAMES PORTER, Assistant-priest,  
 CHARLES FORRESTER, priest, Missionary-Apostolic,  
 THOMAS STANLEY, priest."

---

<sup>1</sup> It has recently been printed, in Dr. John Gilmary Shea's new volume.

At the time of Dr. Carroll's election to the Episcopate, his friend and former associate in the Society of Jesus, the Reverend Charles Plowden, was resident at Lulworth Castle, in the capacity of tutor to the sons of the proprietor. As soon as he got news of the appointment, and he got them very early, Father Plowden wrote to the Bishop-elect.

After tendering his congratulations, he goes on to say: "We wish to know where you are to receive the sacred character. We conceive that, considering the speedy and easy communication with this country, you will prefer a voyage hither to a trip to Quebec or Havana. France is one universal scene of riot and confusion. Mr. Weld orders me to invite you to Lulworth Castle, where he will assemble three bishops to meet you. He will think his castle and new chapel honored by the consecration therein of the first bishop of North America."

This letter bears no date.

November 1st, 1789, Fr. Plowden writes: "The present vacancy in the See of Havana will, we hope, be an additional motive for accepting our invitation to Lulworth, which is again earnestly renewed."

April 4th, 1790, he says: "I expect news of the arrival of your Bulls by the January packet, and of the measures which you mean to take for your consecration. We hope to receive your first Episcopal benediction in this chapel."

Dr. Carroll, having decided to seek consecration in England, sailed thither early in the summer of 1790. In London, where he remained some weeks after his arrival, he received a letter from Father Plowden, who says: "Mr. Weld desires that you will not put yourself to the expense of a pectoral cross, as he has one ready to present to you which he hopes you will accept and like. It is rich, curious and respectable, formerly the property of the last Abbot of Colchester."

On August 3d Father Plowden again writes: "Mr. Weld begs of you the favor to borrow two Pontificals in London, and bring them with you. Bishop Walmesley will be here next Thursday to stay some weeks. You need not, therefore, hurry yourself.

But, three days later, he says: "Bishop Walmesley arrived yesterday. He is not well, and seems rather alarmed about the state of his health. He desires me to tell you 'that, not knowing what may happen,' he wishes you to arrive at the Castle, and be consecrated as early as may suit your convenience. I can only say that the old Bishop wishes that no time be lost."<sup>1</sup>

The ceremony of consecration was performed nine days later,

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Walmesley was the senior Vicar-Apostolic, and Lulworth was in his district.

on the Feast of the Assumption, with a degree of splendor unusual in those days. It was only in *private* chapels, like those at Lulworth and Wardour, that the vestments and other appurtenances requisite for such a function were to be had. Even High Mass was rarely seen outside of London. Mr. Weld charged himself with all the expense incident to the occasion. His generosity is all the more worthy of remembrance from the fact that the houses of most of the distinguished Catholics in England were at that time closed against the Vicars-Apostolic.

Mr. Weld was not able to assemble three prelates for the occasion, despite his promise to do so. Of the four Vicars, two had recently died, and the third was in poor health. In accordance with the tenor of Dr. Carroll's Bulls, Bishop Walmesley was assisted by Fathers Plowden and Porter, some time members of the suppressed Society of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Before the ceremony began, Father Plowden delivered his memorable address, a discourse in every way worthy the solemn occasion that called it forth. The preacher had grasped the full import of the scene about to be enacted. To our generation, which beholds the fulfilment of what he foretold, his words seem little short of prophetic.

It was agreed upon between Mr. Weld and the Bishop-elect that the proceedings of the day were not to be made public. Nevertheless, Father Plowden's sermon soon appeared in the local newspapers. A letter of his to Bishop Carroll dated Lulworth, September 5th, 1790, explains how this came about. The discourse was published without the preacher's knowledge or consent. Bishop Walmesley, owing to his deafness, had been unable to follow the speaker, so, when the ceremony was over, he sent Father Forrester to borrow Father Plowden's manuscript for him. Before it was returned, somebody surreptitiously made a copy.

The chapel of St. Mary of the Assumption at Lulworth is the sanctuary where our hierarchy took its immediate rise. It stands in the park, a short distance from the Castle. A description thereof is given in Hutchins's *History of Dorset*. But that description is, *salva reverentia*, scarcely satisfactory. The following, drawn from a study of plans and photographs kindly furnished the writer by Miss Agnes F. Weld, of Lulworth Castle, will, perhaps, convey a better notion of the building than is afforded by Hutchins. It is

---

<sup>1</sup> In his edition of Palmer's "Church of Christ," New York, 1841, Bishop Whittingham, of Maryland, says, *apropos* of Dr. Carroll's appointment to the See of Baltimore: "There are very serious difficulties affecting the regularity and even the validity of the ordination of the above-mentioned Carroll, and all the Romish clergy of the United States derived from him, in consequence of his ordination having been performed by only one titular bishop, Dr. Walmesley, who appears to have labored under a similar irregularity or deficiency himself,"—vol. i., p. 286, note.



about seventy-six feet long by sixty-one feet wide. Externally, the central feature of the structure is a rectangle forty feet long by about forty-five feet wide, crowned by a dome and lantern. From the cornice at each angle springs a square turret capped by a large stone vase. The two transepts are of the same height as the kernel of the building, are in ground-plan sections of circles, and have domed roofs intersecting the central dome near its base.

What one, judging from outside appearances, would take to be the altar-end, is really the vestibule. This, like the transepts, is a section of a circle, but of greater radius. The east end, where the sanctuary and sacristy are located, is rectangular, about twenty feet long by thirty-two feet wide. The chancel is a semicircle with a radius of twelve feet. But, as the altar-rail is placed some little distance in front of the chancel-arch, the sanctuary is sufficiently roomy. Like the vestibule and transepts, the chancel has a domed roof. Its walls are decorated in the Byzantine style, and the church is ornamented by fine paintings brought over from Italy. The space roofed by the central dome is the main auditorium. The altar is magnificent. Bronze and gold, porphyry and rose alabaster, the rarest and most beautiful marbles are lavished upon it.

The chapel is built of cut stone, and is of two stories. Over the porch, on the eastern gable, is carved the armorial shield of the founder.

It is of Romanesque design. Dr. Milner, who ought to have known better, calls it "Grecian." Though, of course, incomparably smaller, the chapel much resembles, in general outline, the Cathedral church at Baltimore. Cardinal Gibbons told the writer that, on his visit to Lulworth some years ago, he was quite satisfied that Dr. Carroll, when settling the plans of the Cathedral, was guided by memories of the shrine where he received the Episcopal character.

The corner-stone of the chapel was laid by Thomas Weld, the pious and munificent master of Lulworth Castle, on Candlemas-Day, 1786. Under the stone was placed a brass plate bearing a Latin inscription, composed by Father Giovenazzi, S.J., the then librarian of the Altieri Palace. There is a family tradition, somewhat obscure, however, that the founder of the chapel was also its architect. His portrait at Lulworth, which represents him holding the plans of the building in his hand, would seem to confirm the tradition. But this, our informant adds, is uncertain. In its day St. Mary's, Lulworth, was, with perhaps a single exception, the finest place of Catholic worship in England.

Charles Walmesley, O.S.B., titular Bishop of Rama, and Vicar-Apostolic of the Western District, is the link which binds the

---

<sup>1</sup> King George III. twice visited the chapel. "I speak," said Dr. Milner, in one of the sermons he delivered at Lulworth, "within walls, equally known to and equally honored by Pius VI. and George III."

Church of the United States to the Church of St. Austin and St. Gregory. He edified his contemporaries by his holy life. His memory was long held in benediction by those who were witnesses of his zeal and virtue. Moreover, he was celebrated throughout Europe for his literary and scientific performances. To-day, his career, both as scientist and priest, is quite unknown. Even Father Brennan makes no mention of him in his valuable book, *What Catholics have done for Science*.

Some fifty years since, the publisher of the second American edition of Dr. Walmesley's *History of the Church* undertook to supply a biographical sketch of the venerable author. But, despite solicitous inquiries, he was able to collect only a few facts of interest relating to him. The compiler of the present sketch, while perhaps more successful, has experienced no less difficulty than did the editor of 1834, for the Bishop's life was quite uneventful. "His firmness in resisting innovation, his ability and integrity, his unremitting attention to official duties," entitled his memory to the grateful respect and admiration of those who knew him. But his work was mainly diocesan or parochial. The bulk of his correspondence relates to such matters, in which there is little to interest the ordinary reader. In Rome one would hope to find generous materials. But in the Propaganda Archives only two of Dr. Walmesley's communications are to be found. Both are holographs, are written in large, clear, masculine characters, and are signed "Charles Evêque de Rama." All that can be gleaned from the records of the English College is briefly this: He was consecrated in the Sodality chapel there in December, 1756, and was for many years Vicar-Apostolic of Western England.

He was born of ancient and pious stock at Westwood House, Lancashire, England, January 13th, 1722. Two of his brothers became priests of the Society of Jesus. He received his early education in the Anglo-Benedictine College of St. Edmund's, Rue St. Jacques, Paris. Here, at the age of seventeen, he, after one year's novitiate, was professed a monk of the order of St. Benedict. He was ordained in Paris, but just when, we have not been able to learn.

Ten years after his profession he was chosen Prior of St. Edmund's. After completing his quadrennium, he was summoned to Rome as Procurator of his order. Meanwhile he began to be known by reason of his singular ability in mathematics. In 1748, the year preceding his election to the priorate, he had won the applause of the French savants by his essay, *La Théorie du Mouvement des Comètes*. Together with this was published his commentary on Robert Cotes's *Harmonia*, an important contribution to the early stages of Calculus. In the following year he published, also at

Paris, *La Théorie du Mouvement des Apsides*. He was chosen Fellow of the Royal Society of Great Britain, November 1st, 1750, on the recommendation of such men as Buffon, Jussieu and D'Alembert. His certificate calls him a gentleman of very distinguished merit and learning. When the "Act for regulating the commencement of the year and for correcting the calendar now in use" was being drafted, Père Walmesley's assistance was sought by the Government, at the suggestion of the Royal Society, backed by the personal influence of the president thereof, Lord Macclesfield. But no mention of the monk's share in the change of style was made in the prints of that day. The change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar shocked the civic and religious prejudices of the English, and the fact that a priest had anything to do with the Act would, if divulged, have rendered its passage more odious than it really was. In 1755 Père Walmesley made his first contribution to the memoirs of the Royal Academy of Berlin, of which, as well as of the Institute of Bologna, he had, meanwhile, been made a member. He had now achieved a continental reputation as a man of science. But his scientific pursuits did not detract from the regular and edifying performance of his duties as priest and religious.

In the spring of 1756, in his thirty-fifth year, he was elevated to the episcopal dignity. The venerable Bishop York, needing a coadjutor, specially desired Père Walmesley's appointment, he being "perfectly sound in body, and of pleasing and captivating manners." On the 6th of July following, Cardinal Spinelli, Prefect of Propaganda, wrote thus from Parma to the President-General of the Benedictines:

"The election of Father Walmesley as coadjutor to Bishop York is no less an acknowledgment of his merit than a mark of the esteem in which your congregation is held. For myself, I am happy to have contributed towards it, and I do not doubt that the new prelate will equal the expectations that have been formed of his wisdom and virtue."

The "new prelate" was consecrated in Rome, December 21st, 1756, by Cardinal Marcello Federigo Lante, the same, be it said, who gave episcopal consecration to Clement XIV. after his election to the Pontificate. In the following year Bishop Walmesley took up his residence at Bath with the Benedictine missionary who served the faithful in that city. In 1764, on the retirement of Bishop York, he became Vicar-Apostolic of the West. In 1780, during the riots at Bath, the new mission-chapel, the presbytery, the registers of the mission, the diocesan archives, the Bishop's



library and some valuable manuscripts were utterly destroyed.<sup>1</sup> It is consoling to know that the leader in this disgraceful affair was, presently, capitally tried, condemned and hanged.

In 1787 Dr. Walmesley took a house of his own at Bath, where he resided till his death.

At the outset of his episcopal career his duties, as coadjutor, did not withdraw the Bishop from his beloved mathematics. The learned author of the *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics*, etc., is mistaken when he says that at, or soon after, his elevation to the episcopate, Dr. Walmesley gave up entirely his scientific researches. But Mr. Butler speaks to the purpose when he reproaches the English Benedictines that they have not given to the world an account of the prelate's attainments. Such men as Sir John Leslie, Professor Playfair, of Edinburgh, and the late Professor Augustus DeMorgan have written of him in terms of admiration. And Bailly, the celebrated astronomer-mayor of Paris, speaks repeatedly and appreciatively of his brother-savant, Père Walmesley, in his *Histoire de l'Astronomie Moderne* (Paris, 1787).

In 1758 the Bishop made his second contribution to the memoirs of the Berlin Academy—a treatise *De la Méthode des Différences et la Sommation des Séries*.

It will appear, on a careful examination of the *Philosophical Transactions*, that Mr. Charles Walmesley, F.R.S., sent in but four papers during his forty-seven years of membership in the Royal Society. It will, furthermore, appear that Brady, Oliver and M. Le Glay are mistaken when they say that some of his astronomical papers were inserted in the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1745 and the two succeeding years. Of the four papers just alluded to, the first two were sent from Rome to the Astronomer-Royal about a month before their author's consecration. Both are written in Latin, are illustrated by complicated diagrams, and together occupy fifty-three pages quarto; one is entitled, "Essay on the Precession of the Equinoxes and the Mutation of the Earth's Axis." The other is, "A Theory of the Irregularities that may be Occasioned in the Annual Movement of the Earth by the Action of Jupiter and Saturn." Accompanying them is an introductory letter in which the author explains his choice of the geometrical method of proof in preference to the method of Calculus. The third paper is in Latin, and was forwarded to the Astronomer-Royal from Bath, 1758. It is headed, "Of the Irregularities of a Satellite Arising from the Spheroidal Figure of its Primary

<sup>1</sup> It now appears that the mission library at Bath was not entirely destroyed in the fire of 1780. A number of books, formerly belonging to it, and having Bishop Walmesley's autograph on the fly-leaves, turned up lately in a bookseller's shop in London.

Planet." The Bishop apologized for the shortcomings of this paper on the ground of ill-health and press of business.

The fourth and last and most voluminous paper—it covers fifty-seven pages, quarto—is a treatise "On the Irregularities in the Planetary Motions Caused by the Mutual Attraction of the Planets." Like the other three, it is written in Latin. It was dispatched from Bath to Dr. Morton, Secretary of the Royal Society, on November 21st, 1761.

Some time after this date, we know not when, Dr. Walmesley renounced the study of mathematics. The following occurrence is said to have occasioned the renunciation. One day, while at the altar, he found himself so absorbed in the consideration of a problem that had suggested itself to him as to be tracing diagrams on the sacred linens with the paten. In deep contrition he at once forswore science. Thenceforward he gave himself to studies purely ecclesiastical, especially to the interpretation of Scripture. The first fruit of his new investigations was his *History of the Church*, published in 1771, under the pseudonym of "Signor Pastorini." It is an elucidation of the Apocalypse. It proceeds upon the theory that that mysterious book is a summary of the Divine economy regarding the Church from her foundation to her final triumphant estate in Heaven. The work was, in its day, very popular, and is still in demand. An American edition was issued as early as 1807.

According to M. Le Glay, "Correspondant de l'Institut" at Douai, the *History* won for its author from the Faculty of Paris the rank and privileges of a Doctor of the Sorbonne. Maziere Brady seems to think that Bishop Walmesley possessed this distinction before his elevation to the episcopate. But Le Glay says that he gathered the facts contained in his sketch from the monks of St. Gregory at Douai, and from unpublished letters. "Pastorini" was translated into Latin, French, Italian and German. Nay, two German versions were made. But only Father Goldhagen's was printed. The history of the other is interesting.

In 1778 Maur Heatley, Abbot of Lambspring, wrote as follows to the Prior of St. Edmund's at Paris:

"Some time ago I translated "Pastorini" into High German; but our bishop would not allow it to be printed in this diocese (Hildesheim). He objected much to the liberties taken by the author in his arbitrary explanations of the Apocalypse and ancient prophets, and desired me to have no hand in the printing of it. Wherefore, in my opinion, it would be more advisable and answer all purposes to have it printed at Strasburg, whence it would go through the whole empire by the different booksellers at Mayence, Frankfort, Bamberg, etc.; if I can promote the affair with prudence I shall be ever ready to serve you or Mr. Walmesley."

Abbé Feller thought better of "Pastorini" than did the Bishop of Hildesheim. Writing in 1786, he declares that the book is the only good comment on the Apocalypse that England had till then produced. He calls it a learned and edifying performance, and says that the English nation is indebted to the author for his part in putting down the theories of King James and Newton. Learned and edifying the book unquestionably is. It was used by the missionaries in this country more than a century ago with happiest results. Still we cannot help thinking that "Signor Pastorini" is now and then sufficiently extravagant. His book occasioned a curious bit of Irish history. Dr. Doyle, the celebrated Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, had, after strenuous efforts, almost succeeded in extirpating Ribbonism from his diocese. But in 1822 a new edition of "Pastorini" was published in Dublin. Somebody called the attention of the Ribbon leaders to an obscure prediction, or rather calculation, contained in the ninth chapter, to the effect that the fifth vial of Divine wrath was soon to be poured out upon the Protestant world. The report was industriously circulated, and the lodges began to revive in consequence. So great did the evil become that "J. K. L." judged it necessary to rebuke the popular credulity in his celebrated Pastoral of 1822 against the Ribbonmen.

In 1778 *Ezekiel's Vision Explained* was brought out. Writing on March 18th of that year, the Bishop says:

"I am just now publishing a small performance, viz., an explanation of the first chapters of the prophecy of Ezekiel. It has cost me a good deal of meditation and pains at different times, for it has been for some few years past the subject of my thoughts. As to the merit of it, I leave it to take its chances." In October of the same year he writes: "Critics may make whatever objection they choose to my books, and welcome. But I shall not take it upon myself to answer them. The task would be endless. I shall leave my works to take care of themselves."

Almost the only trying episode in the Bishop's life was the contest which, with his brother vicars, he waged against the Catholic Committee. His conduct in that unfortunate business was such as to merit for him the title of "The Athanasius of the English Catholic Church."

In 1783 five laymen, without commission from any one, constituted themselves a committee to manage the affairs of the Catholics of England. Their purpose was to effect the civil and religious emancipation of their co-religionists, and, in particular, to do away with the then existing system of Church government by vicars-apostolic. The vain and presumptuous Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn, was the secretary of this junta. Beyond publishing their programme, the gentlemen of the committee did nothing for four years. At the end of that time they issued a circular let-



ter to their Catholic countrymen containing some remarks little short of schismatical anent the institution of the vicars-apostolic. The laity looked with distrust upon the proceedings of the organization, seeing that the clergy were excluded from its deliberations. To remove this impression, two bishops, the vicar-apostolic of the London District and the coadjutor of the Midland District, were, together with the Rev. Joseph Wilks, the Benedictine missionary at Bath, invited to membership by the committee. The first mentioned prelate afterwards said that he joined to act as a check upon their doings.

In order to prepare the mind of the British public against their intended application to Parliament, the gentlemen of the Committee laid before the Catholics of England for their signatures the so-called "Protestation and Declaration"—a solemn disclaimer of principles vulgarly supposed to be part of the faith of Catholics. This instrument, which purported to be drawn up by a Protestant nobleman, was full of errors, grammatical, logical, and theological. The four vicars at first refused to sign it; but they finally consented to do so after certain modifications had been made. Bishop Walmesley subsequently withdrew his signature, complaining that he had been tricked into subscribing. In round numbers only about 1600 Catholics signed the "Protestation."

At the suggestion of Protestant friends, the Committee now proceeded to transform the "Protestation" into a "Protestation Oath" to be incorporated in the Bill of Relief which they were to introduce into Parliament. The "Oath" had all the errors of the original "Protestation," and others beside. To subscribe to this document was bad enough, but the "Oath" was too much for the consciences of the faithful. To make matters worse, the Bill of Relief was so worded as to benefit only such Catholics as would in a court of justice declare themselves "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." The Vicars-Apostolic, though ostentatiously ignored by the Committee, were watching closely all these strange proceedings. They now judged it time to speak out. At Bishop Walmesley's invitation they met in synod at Hammersmith. An Encyclical Letter condemning the Oath was the result of their deliberations. In his own—the Western—District Bishop Walmesley followed up the Encyclical with a Pastoral explanatory of its provisions. Joseph Wilks, the missionary at Bath, already mentioned as a member of the Committee, not only refused to read the letters to his flock, but spoke publicly against the synod. Showing himself deaf to all expostulation, he was suspended by Bishop Walmesley in the following terms:

"As you have evidently refused submission to the ordinances of the Apostolic Vicars, if before or on Sunday next, the 26th instant, you do not make to me satisfactory submission, I declare

you suspended from the exercise of all missionary faculties and ecclesiastical functions in my district.

"Let this one admonition suffice for all. Carolus Ramaten., Vicar-Apostolic."

After a few months of contumacy Wilks submitted, and was restored. But having written a letter explaining away his submission, he was soon deprived of his faculties for a second time. Dr. Walmesley's action in this matter occasioned, on the part of Wilks's friends, a tremendous uproar, the echoes whereof did not die out for several years. Prominent gentlemen and ladies strove in vain to induce the Bishop to reverse his sentence. Whereupon certain priests, known as the Staffordshire clergy, bound themselves to make the suspended priest's quarrel their own. But all such interference failed of its purpose. For Dr. Walmesley's conduct was applauded by the other vicars and by the Holy See.

Not many months after the issue of the first Encyclical, two of the vicars concerned in its issue died. Butler and his associates schemed vigorously to secure the appointment of friends of the Committee to the vacant positions. The lengths to which they went, or proposed to go, are astonishing. But the Holy See rebuked their impertinence by appointing Drs. Gibson and Douglas: which action nearly caused a schism. Thomas Weld invited the new prelates to come and be consecrated at Lulworth. And there, December 5, 1790, Bishop Walmesley gave consecration to Dr. Gibson, who two weeks later performed the same solemn service for Dr. Douglas.

The Committee being still defiant, Dr. Walmesley and the two new vicars prepared, before leaving Lulworth, a fresh condemnation of the "Oath." But before publishing it they made a last and vain attempt at pacification. The new Encyclical was answered with a scandalous, nay, blasphemous "Protest." Then the Bishops resolved to fight the Bill in Parliament. Dr. Milner was deputed to make interest with the members. So well did he succeed that when the Bill was brought in, decisive action was postponed on the ground that it did not voice the sentiments of the Catholic body. The Government chose to hearken to the conscientious voice of the Vicars-Apostolic rather than to the clamors of the Committee. Nor was the Bill passed till the obnoxious neologism, "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," had been withdrawn, and the still more obnoxious "Oath" discarded. During this long struggle the old Bishop used to say: "I have asked my Master that this bad Oath may not pass, and He will hear my prayers." That the Catholics of England have kept their old and honorable designation before the law, is due beyond any one else to Bishop Charles Walmesley. He did not live to see the end of the troubles of the Church in England. The system of lay interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of the English Catholics, inaugurated by Butler and

his friends in 1783, was for almost forty years afterward a source of disorders, divisions, and irreligion.

Bishop Walmesley closed his long and well-spent life by a happy exit at Bath on the 25th of November, 1797, in the 75th year of his age and the fortieth of his episcopacy. He was buried in St. Joseph's Chapel at Bristol. The beautiful Latin epitaph which records his virtues and his scientific eminence was written by his friend, Father Charles Plowden.

Bishop Walmesley was a man of very severe character. He was the last of the Vicars-Apostolic in England to allow his diocesans the use of flesh meat in Lent. He was much given to meditation on the four last things; and in the company of his friends was wont to repeat the grim warning, "Adesce, festinant tempora." In his dealings with those who sided with Wilks against him, he was perhaps unreasonably severe. One cannot help wondering what became of "the pleasing and captivating manners" that so favorably impressed old Bishop York. The following recital, drawn from a letter of Bishop James Talbot, will give a pretty fair idea of the repute enjoyed by Dr. Walmesley among his contemporaries.

In 1779, when he applied for a coadjutor, he presented to Propaganda the names of three Benedictines. The Roman authorities were displeased. So they wrote to the venerable Bishop Challoner and begged him to answer these three questions:

1. Does Dr. Walmesley really want a coadjutor?
2. What do you know about the gentlemen he has named?
3. Is there no secular priest fit for the position?

Dr. Challoner answered:

1. I do not think Dr. Walmesley really wants an assistant.
2. The three gentlemen are unknown to me and mine.
3. No secular could ever be agreeable to Dr. Walmesley, nor would any secular ever choose to be assistant to him. He concludes by suggesting that matters had better remain "in statu quo."

Dr. Walmesley, however, got his Benedictine assistant, whom he consecrated at Wardour Castle with a splendor of ceremonial never seen in England since the days of Philip and Mary.<sup>1</sup>

A word or two about the priests whose names are appended to Bishop Carroll's certificate. They were all ex-Jesuits. Charles Plowden was the most distinguished of the quartette. He was born in 1743 of a good old English Catholic family, and entered the Jesuit novitiate at the age of sixteen. At the time of the suppression of his order he was imprisoned for about six months in

---

<sup>1</sup> The engraving of Bishop Walmesley which serves as the frontispiece of the American edition of "Pastorini" is, in the estimation of those who have seen the authentic portrait at Downside, but a poor likeness. The Downside portrait represents him in the habit of his order and without episcopal insignia.



Belgium. In 1784 he settled at Lulworth Castle as tutor to the sons of Mr. Weld. Ten years later he went to Stonyhurst, which was his home for twenty-three years. In 1817 he was chosen Provincial of his English brethren. He died in France, June, 1821, while on his way from Rome to England. He was buried in the parish where he died, strange to say, with the military honors due to a French general.

He was a universal scholar, and especially admired for his literary ability. Let any one who doubts this read his address at Dr. Carroll's consecration. Eight of his published works are mentioned in the "Collectanea S. J." One of them, a pamphlet on the Papal Infallibility, is considered by Hürter to entitle him to a place among the theologians who have deserved well of the Church since the Council of Trent. A letter to Dr. Carroll, wherein he states his intention of writing that pamphlet and narrating the events leading to it, is to be seen in the archives of the See of Baltimore. "Indeed," says Dr. Oliver after summing up Father Plowden's literary labors, "his pen was never idle." It was he, by the way, who induced Bishop Walmesley to convoke the synod which condemned the "Protestation Oath," who was that prelate's ablest ally in the long and bitter contest with the Committee, and it was he who prevailed upon Thomas Weld to throw open his castle and chapel for the consecration of Bishops Gibson and Douglas.

Father James Porter, the other priest assistant, was born in the Low Countries, of English parents, in 1733. He entered the Society in 1752, and eighteen years later became one of the professed Fathers. Renouncing a considerable estate, he led for many years the life of a poor missionary in Wiltshire, England. He died in 1810.

Father Charles Forrester, alias Fleury, was a Frenchman. He lived at Wardour Castle as missionary and chaplain from 1775 to 1810. He was an able, zealous, and amiable priest. When the Society was restored, he reunited himself to it. He died in 1825.

Thomas Stanley had been for many years previous to Dr. Carroll's consecration one of the household at Lulworth. He went to live there shortly after the marriage of his niece to Thomas Weld. He was born in 1715, and became a novice in 1732. He died at the castle, full of years and merits, in 1805.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer wishes here to tender his grateful acknowledgments to all who have helped him in the preparation of this paper, but especially to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons; the Gustavo Conrado, Rector of Propaganda; to Dom Gilbert Dolan, O. S. B., of St. Gregory's, Downside, Bath; to Father Reginald Colley, S. J., Rector of Stonyhurst; to Father Lennon, President of St. Cuthbert's, Ushaw, Durham; to Father Caswell, Librarian at Oscott; to Miss Agnes F. Weld, of Lulworth Castle; to Joseph Gillow, Esq., of Bowdon, Cheshire, author of the "Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics," and lastly but most cordially to his old friend of "The Mountain," Mr. Haldeman O'Connor, who has rendered invaluable service by his researches in the British Museum Library.

## THE LAST FOUR YEARS IN BELGIUM.

THE lover of liberty turns his eyes hopefully to Belgium, where a brave struggle for the rights of the people, home rule, tolerance, order and religion has been rewarded with a memorable victory. As the latest developments of this struggle bring out clearly the real position of the opposing social and political forces of our day, a summary of more recent Belgian history has an especial interest and value. The facts tell more than one practical lesson.

Belgium won her independence in 1830. During the fifty-eight years that have since gone by, the Government has been almost continuously in the hands of a so-called Liberal party. The Conservatives held office from 1846 to 1847; from 1854 to 1857; and again from 1870 to 1878. Carried once more into power by a great popular wave in 1884, they still control the Government by a majority, both in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, so large as to make their position secure for many a day. From 1830 to 1846 there was little of party feeling in Belgium. Above all there was no organized anti-religious party. A liberal constitution guaranteed every citizen the largest freedom of thought, speech and action. In the hands of right-minded, patriotic, liberal, progressive, far-seeing men, Belgium would long ago have been raised high above the nations as an exemplar of true liberty. But personal ambitions, the influence of revolutionary ideas and of the modern spirit of irreligion, the growth of a bad kind of Masonry, directed by men who accepted the radical teachings of the Italian, German and French lodges, in time divided the people, put the majority on the defensive, weakened the country, and forced it out of the way of true progress. In 1846 there was already an opposition party which, liberal in fact, was, for the sake of distinction from the ministerial party, Conservative in name, and Catholic. The ministerial party had dubbed itself "Liberal," but was Radical; and that word meant then, as nowadays it means, anti-Catholic, if not anti-Christian. Partly on account of a want of unity, due to the mistaken importance given to certain questions that were assumed to involve Catholic principles; partly on account of a lack of thorough organization, and an abundance of the spirit of *laissez-faire* that has long gone by the name of "patience" among Catholics in all countries; partly through a misapprehension of the

real purposes and the audacity of those who masqueraded under the name of Liberals; and, more than all, on account of the conscienceless, lawless, revolutionary methods which the Radicals made use of, the Conservative-Catholic party, which really represented the country, was, as we have seen, almost continuously in a minority in the two Chambers. Up to the present day the Government has been under their control for but sixteen years out of the whole fifty-eight of Belgian autonomy.

As must invariably happen where the principles of a party are not based on religion, the tendency of the so-called Liberal party was steadily in the direction of greater and greater Radicalism. Power was by degrees more and more centred in the State. The liberties of the Provinces and the Communes were violated, abrogated. Catholics were hampered, deprived of constitutional rights, and, indeed, denounced as unworthy of any freedom other than that which it might please their open enemies to concede them. The finances of the country were mismanaged, and the debt and taxes increased without any satisfactory return to the people. Worse than all, a propaganda, not of philosophical infidelity, but of forceful, riotous, anarchic irreligion, fostered by the very Ministers themselves, was actively at work among the people. The necessities of ministry after ministry compelled them to sacrifice the views of moderate men to the demands of the narrow-minded, the bitter, the blindly unpatriotic Radical wing of the party. Finally, in 1879, Frère-Orban's School Law was passed, and a rude blow given to the liberties of the individual and the Commune. The education of the people was put under the absolute rule of the State; and a compulsory system of irreligious teaching was forced upon the citizens, on the ground that the Ten Commandments of God and the laws of the Church nullified conscience.

Of the bold, manly, intelligent and successful opposition made to this illiberal law, we gave some account in the pages of this REVIEW several years ago.<sup>1</sup> The people, awakened from their sleep, organized themselves in defence of the liberties guaranteed them by the Constitution, of their natural rights, of the Christian religion. On the other hand, the Radicals who had forced the Government into the ways of tyranny were more than ever audacious in their methods and exacting in their demands. They did not realize the temper of the people. But when the people were ready they made clear their purpose to be rid of the men who would have put them under the rule of a despotism. At the elections of May and June, 1884, the Conservative-Catholics, supported by

---

<sup>1</sup> "The School Question in Belgium."—CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1885.



all the liberty lovers of the country, were carried into office with the remarkable majorities of 34 in the Chamber of Deputies and of 17 in the Senate. Before the elections they were in the minority by 20 votes in the Chamber and 5 in the Senate. This peaceful revolution has only gathered strength with time. The elections of 1886 gave the Conservative-Catholic party a majority of 56 in the Chamber of Deputies and an increased majority in the Senate. No ministry had ever come before the Chambers with a like majority to back it. The events of the two following years only served to fix the people's confidence in a Conservative-Catholic ministry. Witness the elections of 1888, when the majority in the Chamber of Deputies was increased to 58, and that in the Senate to 33. And yet, if you remember, in 1884 the American journals were informing us that the "Clericals" were treading on dangerous ground, and that their opposition to Radical centralization was "iniquitous and inexcusable!"

The ministry which came into office under Malou, in June, 1884, was not slow in giving back to the country the liberties which had been temporarily filched from it. Within six weeks a new School Bill, that recognized and guarded the natural rights of the parent, the constitutional liberties of the Communes, and the rights of minorities, was presented to both Houses. A month later the bill was passed and received the King's signature. The attempt of the Radicals to intimidate the Ministry, the Chambers, and the King, by mobs, riots and bloodshed, came to nought. The Ministry maintained the peace by firm, moderate measures. When the King, listening to the suggestions of one of the most radical of the ex-ministers, Bara, tried to force a compromise ministry on Malou, after the elections in the autumn of 1884, the Ministry rejected the proposal as a unit. When he requested the resignation of MM. Jacobs and Woeste, who had been active in drawing up and passing the new School Law, they declined to resign unless under the exercise of the King's prerogative; and as the King unreasonably exercised his prerogative, Malou resigned, saying to the King that, after fighting for the crown and the country against "Liberalism" and Radicalism for forty years, he was unwilling to seem to accept the King's line of conduct. Bernaert, who is still Premier, took Malou's place, and brought into his Cabinet M. Thonissen, the well-known Professor of Law at Louvain, and Caraman-Chimay, who had served of old under Conservative governments.

The Radicals who called themselves Liberals, as well as those who, scouting the name Liberal, would be known only as Radicals, were not satisfied with the turn of affairs. They hoped that force would have helped them to save some of their bad work. But they counted without their host. The Conservative-Catholics

had given way to force, years before, in the interest of what was called the peace of the country. Now they had determined that there should be peace, not at the expense of the peaceful citizens, but rather at the expense of the law-breakers and revolutionaries. On the 18th of November, 1884, Frère-Orban, who could not hide his fears and his spite, asked the new Ministry whether the recent changes meant only changes of persons, or a real change of policy. And Bernaert seized the occasion to make his position clear before the country. The changes in the Ministry were, he said, due to the exercise of the royal prerogative; on questions of principle, the present Ministry had the same convictions as the former Ministry. The frankness and courage of this answer, with its direct defence of parliamentary government against the uncalled for interference of royalty, and its clear announcement of a definite policy in accordance with the wishes of the people as expressed in the election, had a far-reaching effect. The Radical-Liberals called off their professional agitators and rioters; and the Government proceeded, with no uncertain hand, to put into execution the new School Law. Discussing this law, in 1885, we qualified it as "a just law," "a law of statesmen," a law "devised to meet existing conditions," a law "assuring freedom of instruction and protecting the rights of the minority." The eagerness with which the Communes availed themselves of its liberal provisions, and their satisfaction with its working, as shown by the popular vote at every election since its passage, testify to the correctness of our appreciation of the Malou School Law. No better evidence could be offered of the soundness of the Ministry's position and the malice of the riotous opposition to the law than that given by the action of the Radical-Liberals within a few weeks after Bernaert's manly speech.

A certain M. Buls, Burgomaster of Brussels, a forward Radical, and, of course, a forward Mason, founder of the political club called the "Educational League," had used his position to encourage the agitation against the School Law, the Ministry and the King. He it was who gave preference and precedence to the Radical demonstration against the bill; he it was who permitted the mob to attack and maltreat the Conservative demonstration in favor of the bill, and for this he was publicly censured by the Senate; he it was who organized the extraordinary league of Radical burgomasters—these are not elective officers—who, in meeting assembled, swore a solemn oath to prevent the signing and execution of the new School Law, by every *legal* means; he it was who issued a manifesto as late as September 15th, advising the world that he, and the burgomasters allied with him, would *never* cease using the threatened legal means against the law. By the 5th of Decem-

ber the terrible burgomasters, who had sworn the mighty oath, had come to an agreement to *propose to their Communal Councils to place rooms at the disposal of the clergy, in which they might give religious instruction*, out of school hours. The Radical Communal Council at Ghent had eaten its leek a week earlier. How bold they were when in power, these men of compromise! When they were about to trample on the Constitution in 1879, Minister Von Humbeek voiced the views of all the roaring Bulls: "The teaching contained in the ten commandments of God, and in the laws of the Church, is the absolute negation of liberty of conscience, the teaching of a sect; on this account, from this time forward, this teaching would not be put before the pupils by the teacher; it would be excluded from elementary education." And here, alas! we find M. Van Humbeek *excluded* from the Government, and the Radicals violating whatever conscience they have, in order to accommodate the clergy who may wish to instruct the pupils how to "negate" liberty of conscience, after school hours! What a fine teacher adversity is!

The Frère-Orban Ministry used the unpopular School Law to serve purposes not disclosed in the bill. Belgium had continuously held diplomatic relations with the Papacy. Failing to obtain the Pope's aid in the Radical attack on the Church, Frère-Orban had contemptuously withdrawn the Belgian representative at the Vatican. In answer to an interpellation from the Conservatives on April 23d, 1884, about six weeks before the defeat of the Radicals at the polls, the Minister of Foreign Affairs declared that a renewal of diplomatic relations with the Papal See was impossible. Within three months from this date, on July 18th, Malou telegraphed to Rome, proposing a renewal of diplomatic relations. On the 8th of August both houses passed a bill to that effect, and appropriated monies to meet the expenses of the mission. Meantime Malou resigned. Under Bernaert the negotiations were completed, and on March 30th, 1885, the Pope nominated the President of the Ecclesiastical Academy, Monsignor Domenico Ferrata, as Nuncio to Belgium. Within eleven months after coming into office the Conservatives had performed the "impossible!"

But they had then done, and they have since done, many things possible and desirable. When the Conservative Catholic Ministry resigned in 1878, after eight years of rule, it left a well-filled treasury. The receipts exceeded the expenses by some \$7,000,000. Evidently the Radicals looked upon a moderate surplus as a national evil. Within five years they had not only made away with the surplus, but had issued new loans to the amount of \$80,000,000, laid more than \$5,000,000 of new taxes on the people, and accumulated a deficit of \$13,000,000. The Conservative-



Catholics were quick to find a remedy against this comprehensive system of waste. Shortly before their defeat, on March 4th, the Radicals had presented the budget for 1885, showing a modest deficit of \$700,000. The Bernaert Ministry brought in a new budget, based on other notions of official responsibility and public economy. As a result, the proposed deficit was turned into a surplus of \$400,000. The budget of 1886 showed a surplus of \$535,000; that of 1887 a surplus of \$2,400,000. Meantime, the annual expenditures had been steadily reduced, and, in 1887, were \$3,000,000 less than in 1884. The Radical love of liberty is too often apparent only in a free handling of the public purse. Under the management of the Conservative-Catholics Belgian credit was so strengthened that, in August, 1886, the Ministry announced its intention of refunding the national debt, which carried 4 per cent., into a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. obligation, and this operation has since been effected, with a saving of somewhat over \$1,000,000 a year. To us who saddled ourselves joyfully with a debt of a couple of milliards—partly that we might know what it was to be blessed—and who think nothing of paying off \$20,000,000 of bonds in a week, these little savings may seem hardly worth reckoning. But with the crowded and poorly paid population of Belgium every little counts. Every little counts here, if we only realized it; and, in good time, we shall certainly have to learn the lesson that the rest of the world was forced to learn long ago. In Belgium strict economy is absolutely necessary. Were there no such thing as patriotism, or justice, or common humanity, the law of self-preservation would compel sane men to keep down the expenditure to the lowest point possible. The country is the most densely inhabited in Europe. When the first census of the new kingdom was taken in 1831, the population numbered 3,785,814. Since that date there has been a considerable Belgian emigration, and yet on the 31st of December, 1885, there was a population of 5,853,278. The rate of increase has been steadily higher than in any other European country. With this notable and regular growth of the population, and the declining prices for coal, iron, grain and cattle, true politicians find themselves facing a problem which is to be solved only by the greatest prudence.

Having in part undone the work of centralization which the Radical Liberals had so boisterously pushed along, and having lightened the burdens of all classes, the Ministry next sought the best means to give the people a larger voice in their own government. The policy of the Conservative-Catholics may be summed up in two words: Home Rule and Popular Representation. One would imagine they were liberals! Strange to say, during the whole time the Radical Liberals held office, they were uniformly opposed to

any extension of the franchise. Nowadays, when universal suffrage is assumed to be a cure for all political and social ills, we expect a Liberal to be somewhat radical on the question of manhood suffrage. But the Belgian Radical Liberals were more than conservative on this subject. Up to 1885 there were only twenty voters to the thousand in Belgium. Of the total male adult population, one-thirteenth enjoyed the franchise. The exclusion of so large a proportion of the citizens from the right to vote was due, in part, to the Constitution, and, in part, to the system of taxation that had been long in vogue. There are three classes of voters in Belgium. Any citizen, paying taxes yearly to the amount of ten francs, may vote for members of the Communal Councils. These Councils control the police, the public works, and the public institutions of their respective Communes, and from among the members of these Councils the King selected the burgomaster, or mayor, and certain others to perform the duties of Aldermen. In order to vote for members of the Provincial Councils that exercise general powers over the nine provinces into which Belgium is divided, the citizen must pay taxes yearly to the amount of twenty francs. When it comes to voting for parliamentary representatives, the Constitution is much more exacting. Only those can vote who pay a yearly tax of forty-two francs thirty-five centimes. This requirement of the Constitution threw the control of the general government into the hands of a body of citizens relatively much smaller in number than that which directed the affairs of the provinces and communes. Any lowering of the constitutional limit of taxation, or alteration in the tax laws, would have increased the vote of the farmers. There are fully 800,000 Belgians directly engaged in agricultural pursuits. As skilful tillers of the land, and breeders of cattle, they are known the world over. The rare rate of increase in population is a proof of their morality, and the credit of the country testifies to their industry and frugality. The Radical Liberals feared the free expression of the farmers' vote. The party was not merely opposed to extending the franchise, but it sought to nullify the influence of the agricultural vote in the Provincial and Communal Councils, where it was more general by reason of the more moderate requirements of the laws on taxation and representation. To make this vote unavailing, to deprive it of its rightful voice in local affairs, the Radicals tried to wrench from province and commune their constitutional and traditional rights, and to centre them in the hands of the general government, the least representative body in the kingdom. Was this policy based on an ardent love of liberty? No, but on a love of power and a narrow spirit of illiberal, tyrannical intolerance. The farming class is not irreligious, and it is conservative, orderly, Catholic.

The Frère-Orban ministry was opposed to any extension of the franchise; the Radical doctrinaires, philosophers and press were opposed to the extension of the franchise, and, of course, the Belgian lodges would have none of it. Universal suffrage would have fixed the Catholics in power for an indefinite period. But the Catholics had no desire to force the question. In the actual position of parties nothing could be done. To have manhood suffrage the Constitution would have to be revised. A revision of the Constitution can be effected only by a vote of both houses, dissolution, a new election and an adoption of proposed amendments by a two-thirds vote in the house and the senate. As parties stood, the Conservatives could do nothing to bring on universal suffrage. Nor, indeed, could the Radical Liberals. However, they could have widened the suffrage without a revision, had they not feared the consequences. Towards the end of its last lease of power, the party found itself in straits. The Radicals of a few years back had been distanced by a new set of Radicals. These were republican, socialistic, anarchist. They wanted universal suffrage, because they could not get it. Their purpose was one of agitation, disturbance, revolution. To give way to them, meant the destruction of the so-called Liberal party, the overturning of the Ministry, and a new order of things. But the case was desperate. Even were the party united, it was plain that the people were aroused, and meant to bury the Radical Liberals deep down under their own folly. The Ministry conceived a specious scheme, by which they hoped to pacify the real Radicals, to blind the friends of liberty, and to create a fictitious Radical Liberal majority. As it happened, they only dug a deeper pit for themselves. Frère-Orban brought in a law extending the franchise. This law gave a vote to certain classes of employees and officials, regardless of the payment of taxes; and, further, made a distinctive class of non-taxpaying voters out of those who should receive a diploma after a government examination—a sort of “civil service” voting class. This scientific extension of the franchise was skilfully qualified by regulations forbidding non-commissioned officers and soldiers to vote, while serving with the colors, and providing that the clergy should vote *at the places where they lived before entering the ministry*. The purpose of this bill is evident. It was not meant to enlarge the franchise; but it was meant to increase the Radical-Liberal vote and to diminish that of the Conservatives. This piece of pettifogging politics did not work as expected. After all, a man may have a diploma, and, at the same time, a sense of honor, justice and patriotism. So the event proved.

In January, 1885, the Bernaert Ministry gave notice of their intention to introduce a bill extending the franchise. They kept



their word ; and since that date they have not only taken care that the Senate and Chamber of Deputies shall more truly represent the people, but they have divested the Crown, or the Ministry, of certain rights heretofore exercised by one or the other, to the exclusion of the Provincial or Communal Councils. Nowhere has the principle of "home rule" received a heartier acknowledgment than in Belgium under a Catholic-Conservative government.

They have no income tax in Belgium. Hence the status of the parliamentary elector, paying 42 fr. 35 ct. per annum, depended on the legal methods of apportionment of several special taxes. Since, by the requirements of the Constitution, only those could vote who paid a definite sum of taxes, extension of the franchise was possible, at the moment, only through a redistribution of taxation. The position was a difficult one. Seldom does an occasion present itself when a class that escapes taxation is desirous of assuming a new share of the taxes. The country, however, appreciated the difficulty ; knew that the country alone was to blame for the actual state of things ; and was not only willing, but desirous, that the Ministry should enlarge the franchise by the best, and only practicable, means. To meet the wishes of the people, the Ministry, on July 10th, 1885, introduced a bill which placed the whole of the land tax on the tenants. This bill was passed on August 12th of the same year ; and Belgium took its first step forward in the path of popular representation. Hereafter, the son of the soil, the sturdy farmer, who pays a goodly share of taxes out of his hard earnings, will stand on a level with the townsman who pays no taxes, but, in lieu, patriotically bears the yoke of a government diploma.

The Machiavellian regulations of the Frère-Orban ministry, which practically disqualified military officers, clergymen, commercial travellers, boatmen, and other business men who had more than one residence, or place of business, were so modified as to assure the franchise to the honest voter. These democratic measures were hotly opposed by the Revolutionaries and the Radical Liberals. That the ministry would have gone much further in its acknowledgment of popular rights, were it not for the untoward events of 1886, is apparent from the bill adopted on November 24th, 1887, by which the right of appointment of the aldermen was taken away from the King, and put in the hands of the communal councils. The King still nominates the burgomasters, or mayors ; but, even so, the government of the Belgium communes approaches more nearly to the ideal of "home rule," is freer, more popular, more democratic-republican, than that of many of our American cities.

The open, fair, progressive temper of the Catholic-Conservative

party is again emphasized by the bill introduced by the Bernaert ministry, on January 24th, 1888, a bill which the Chamber of Deputies forthwith resolved to take into consideration. This bill is in the interest of minorities, and, by a system of proportional representation, assures minorities a voice in public affairs. There is such a thing as *true* radicalism—a going to the root of things as they are. Compare it with that immoral, disorderly, indecent, blasphemous, contemporary thing called “Radicalism”; and then let all but knaves, fools, and madmen take their choice.

During its long years of rule, the Radical Liberal party, while showing a thorough contempt for the rights of the people, for liberal government, for progress, had endeavored to lower the moral standing of the townspeople, to divide class against class, to enforce the spread of ideas subversive of all law and all peace. It was with this object that they strove “to drive out the Catholic religion from elementary education.” But while the Catholic religion was the one they selected for their attacks, their real object was the total repression of all Christian teaching whatever. As one of their forward spokesmen announced, they wished “to secularize heaven as well as the earth”; “to do away with Christian spiritualism, the terrors of a future life, the pre-occupation with an imaginary salvation.” Unfortunately they succeeded to a certain extent, especially among the workingmen. When the Frère-Orban ministry was thrown out of power, it took the leaders some months to realize that their case was hopeless. Then the less radical element, or to put it more truly, the element that retained a longing for the offices, and was practical enough to know that these were not to be reached by the road of the Irreconcilables, undertook to reorganize the Radical Liberal party. Many who were ready to go to any length when in power, now pleaded for what they called moderation. But the true blue Radicals, under Janson, President of the Brussels Liberal Association, refused to give up an iota of their “principles.” The Radical Liberal party was split in twain; and split it is until this day. Negotiations begun from time to time, generally during the election campaigns, have all come to nothing. Recrimination has been the order of the day. Meantime Janson’s activity was not without effect. Around him he rallied a party made up of “secularized” democrats, who want a republic; of labor reformers, socialists, anarchists—*bonâ fidê* revolutionaries. Thanks to the good will, and the unremitting propaganda, of their French and German brothers, the Belgian workingmen, more especially the factory hands, miners, and workers in the large industrial establishments, have been won over to the worst forms of socialism. The army, too, has proved a good nursery for these pernicious teachings.

How wide an influence they had gained, how thoroughly a large body of poor men had been indoctrinated with the idea that force was a fair and serviceable means of attaining an end not bad in itself—and this they had been practically taught by the organized system of riots which the Radical Liberal party had used as a political means for nigh on to twenty years—how deeply the Radical Liberal press, and the un-Christian lodge and school, had undermined the public morals, was brought to light only in 1886.

The history of the greater part of that year is a painful record of riots, incendiarism, murder, ruthless destruction of private property, and forcible repression. Whatever reasonable occasion there may have been for local strikes, or whatever ills the workingmen of particular sections may have had just reason to complain of, there is strong evidence that the movement begun in Brussels on March 18th was a deliberate, organized movement, managed by the native and foreign socialist leaders. The 18th of March is the sad anniversary of the Paris Commune. On that day, at Brussels as well as at Liège, there was a commemorative demonstration of workingmen. The Brussels contingent paraded the streets, with banners, and flags, and noisy cries. Some shop windows were smashed; there were inflammatory speeches, of course; and there the matter ended. At Liège the celebration was of a heartier character. There the "workingmen" flung the red flag to the breeze, and encouraged peaceful citizens with shouts of "Down with Capital," "Death to the *Bourgeois*." The celebrants carried sticks, and, at a given signal they broke ranks, made their way into the shops, plundered right and left, and then took to wrecking. By the 21st the men in the collieries near Liège had begun to go out on strike. Bands of strikers robbed in broad daylight, and destroyed what they could not carry away. Meantime socialist meetings were held at Brussels, the men attending them being all armed with revolvers. By the 29th of the month there was a general strike throughout the whole district extending from Liège to Tournai, along the French border. The men in the coal mines and stone quarries, iron-workers, glass-workers, workers of all sorts, had laid down their tools, some willingly, some whether they would or not. From the revolutionary press they received every encouragement. The socialist leaders were active in direction. Placards were posted up recommending that the men should go armed to their public meetings. Liège, Namur, Charleroi, Mons, Tournai, were all centres of disturbance. The farmers were forced to pay cash indemnities to strikers; shops were sacked; blast furnaces extinguished; the great glassworks of the Hainault district pillaged and burned, one after the other. Country seats, châteaux, colleges, convents, were fired. There was a plentiful supply of petroleum



and beer. Axes, bludgeons, revolvers, were used effectively by the mob, and many lives were taken. Town upon town was in an actual state of siege.

The movement was wholly unexpected ; but the Government was prompt in taking measures to preserve the peace. It did not interfere, however, until events proved that neither police, gendarmes, nor civic guards, could deal with the rioters. On March 28th a state of siege was proclaimed throughout the districts covered by the strike, and general orders were given to fire without hesitation on all rioters. The army reserves of 1881, 1882, were called out, and the soldiery, under General Vander Smissen, took the strikers in hand. He adopted drastic measures. They were appreciated. By the 31st of the month work had been resumed at most of the collieries and factories ; and on the 7th of April the General was able to announce that order had been re-established. The strikes had not been settled. There was a constant force at work in the interest not of the workingmen, but of political agitation. New strikes were common, week after week, up to the 1st of September. One day the quarrymen struck at one place, returned to work in a week or two ; after a few days struck again. The next day it was the miners' turn. Sometimes the strikes were by districts ; then, at odd places wide apart.

A review of the political side of the strikes may prove interesting. No sooner had the celebration of the anniversary of the Paris Commune ended than the Radicals, Socialists, and Anarchists opened a sympathetic campaign. Brussels of course was the headquarters. There they held nightly meetings and processions. The King was loudly abused from the platform. A procession marched to the palace, to sing the Marseillaise under the King's windows. The strikers and rioters were applauded. Outside help was generous in its sacrifices. Foreign revolutionaries crowded into the capital. Early in the movement, Henri Rochefort, and Laguerre, the Paris Socialist Deputy, came to offer their services. But the Government was not sympathetic, and warned them to keep on their own side of the border. The Radical press directed and encouraged the rioters ; denounced the coal and mine operators, and the manufacturers, as men gorged with profits, and deservedly pillaged ; reproached the government for keeping the peace, and demanded that the state expropriate the present owners, intrust the working of the coal mines to syndicates of colliers, and introduce universal suffrage. Indeed the whole movement was, apparently, engineered with the idea of forcing universal suffrage by means of a reign of terror. On April 25th five hundred delegates, representing 104 societies, held a "Workmen's Congress," at Brussels. As a result of this meeting, the secretary of the

"Belgian Workingmen's Party" notified the Burgomaster of Brussels that the workingmen would make a demonstration in favor of universal suffrage, on June 13th, that they would to the number of from 80,000 to 100,000 parade through the streets of Brussels, and that, on behalf of the workingmen's party, he requested that the military should not be called upon to preserve order. M. Buis, the Burgomaster, who had, probably, learned by this time the risks of rioting, answered that under the circumstances he considered it his duty to forbid any public demonstration. The Government, on the 30th, gave notice that the procession would not be allowed. This was a costly set-back for the organizers of the demonstration, as money had been already distributed among the workingmen to encourage them to be present, and they had been furnished with pistols at the low price of two francs apiece. As the 13th of June approached rumors were rife in Brussels that the socialist leaders were preparing for a demonstration. The people took fright. Factories, banks, and shops were closed. But the alarm was false. The agitators were satisfied to show their power by inaugurating strikes, on that day, at Ghent, Charleroi, and Seraing. There the red flag was unfurled, amid cries of "*Vive la République.*" A congress of workingmen issued an address to the country, advising that the workingmen's party should contest all elections, and proposing a general strike, and they gave notice of a "monster" demonstration to be held on August 15th, the Belgian national feast-day. Should this be prohibited, they threatened a strike throughout the length and breadth of the country on the day following. The Congress adjourned on June 15th. Here are a few pearls that dropped from the mouth of the gentleman who made the closing speech. "To us belongs the State, with its laws and its powers. We will make of Belgium a *paradise*, and expel the priests, the exploiters, and everything else opprobrious and shameful." Evidently this thoroughgoing reformer had studied a Liberal Catechism, and thus failed to grasp the distinction between a paradise and a hell.

Finally, these good brothers passed a resolution recommending that the Socialists should boycott the *bourgeoisie*. On July 4th the workmen's party made public a second threat of a general strike should the demonstration of August 15th be interfered with. Meantime the Radicals, Socialists, and Anarchists fell to fighting. The Socialists repudiated the Radicals—place-hunters they called them—who had heretofore been the directing spirits. The Anarchists rejected both the other parties. Universal suffrage they pronounced mere flummery. The only cure for social evils, they asserted, was revolution, and then anarchy. At last the long talked of day arrived. The Government fixed the route of the proces-

sion; posted 600 police and gendarmes at fitting points; called out 6000 of the civic guard; put the garrison of 6000 men under arms, and garrisoned the neighboring towns. The promised 100,000 men numbered in fact only 15,000. They carried the red flag and the Phrygian cap instead of the national colors; shouted for Amnesty, the Republic, and Universal Suffrage, and then, no doubt, followed the needless suggestion of the organ of the Ghent Socialists, "to go to the public houses—there to discuss with the people on the premises the usefulness and necessity of universal suffrage." Certainly this "monster" demonstration was a poor return to the workingmen and the country for the seventy men who had been killed in the riots; for the losses in wages, the destruction of property, the increased local and general taxation. The glass industry was ruined, the communes were mulcted by the courts for extraordinary damages, the Government had to bring in a bill indemnifying private owners for grave losses. Prices rose, and the iron and coal interests lost their own market through the competition of the French and German mines. Numbers of natives and foreigners were jailed, indicted, tried, and condemned to lengthy terms of imprisonment.

The Government did not wait for the settlement of the strikes, or the putting down of the riots, to show its honest interest in the condition of the workingmen. A committee of twenty-six members of the Chambers was appointed in March, 1886, to inquire into the condition of the working people, and to formulate and present such reformatory laws as might be found needful. This committee began its sittings in April, and has since, from time to time, reported many beneficial measures.

The wages of the Belgian workingmen are low. Fortunately the cost of living is proportionately low. Our own coal miners have good reason to find fault in odd years. But, if report speak true, they have more reason to blame the operators than the Belgian miners have. There are 149 separate coal companies in Belgium. In the eight years from 1876 to 1884 one-half of these were operated at a loss, whose total amount figured up to 14,700,000 dollars. The gross profits of the paying mines within the same period amounted to 18,500,000 dollars. Had the gaining operators paid off the losses of the less fortunate companies the total profits of the business of the eight years would have been less than 4,000,000 dollars, less than 2 per cent. on the capital invested. The year 1884 was especially unfavorable. While the miners received 56 per cent. of the gross income, the operators received only 1 per cent. and a small fraction. Had the whole of the profits been given to the miners they would have had a cent a



day additional. Besides the dulness of trade that has been felt the world over, the Belgian mines have had to contend with two special factors which time cannot modify—the competition of the French and German mines and the great depth which the Belgian mines have reached. Still there were abuses that could be remedied. The “truck” system, no longer a benefit with our modern means of distribution, was found to be more extensively practised than had been supposed. The commission promptly brought in a law abolishing the system. And they have since passed a law forbidding a vicious custom that had come into vogue in the mines, the employment of young girls. The laws presented and passed, in the interest of workingmen generally, are numerous. One makes it unlawful to pay a workingman’s wages otherwise than in cash. Another makes inalienable two-fifths of a workingman’s pay. Still another provides that, where town improvements make inroads on existing buildings, a certain proportion of the land expropriated shall be reserved for workingmen’s houses.

Alcoholism is the vice of the day, and the workingman’s greatest enemy. Here we suffer quite enough from it. But a journey through Belgium would make a moderate American drinker think himself a total abstainer. A fair picture of the situation is given in the following extract from a Flanders journal, published in the *London Times* of Sept. 18th, 1888: “The daily consumption of a workingman—not a drunkard—is, at 5.30 A.M., a “worm killer”; at 8 A.M., an “eye-opener”; at 11 A.M., a “whip”; at 2 P.M., a “digger”; at 5 P.M., a “soldier”; at 7.30 P.M., a “finisher.” His yearly expenditure, without counting extra drinks on festivals, is 219 francs—out of 800 to 1200 francs.” Should universal suffrage ever come to Belgium, a provision that this variety of workingman should cast his vote before 10.30 A.M. would not be amiss. Still the subject is too serious for even a passing joke; and the commission, recognizing its seriousness, brought in several bills with a view to remedying the evil. By law the number of drinking places is fixed according to population. The right to sue for public-house debts has been abolished. The sale of liquor is forbidden in disorderly houses. Every publican convicted of selling drink to an intoxicated person, or to minors, is punished with fine and imprisonment; and the same penalty attaches to every person found drunk in a public place.

In the interest of harmony between workingmen and employers, and of the peaceful development of trade, the commission passed a bill establishing “Councils of Industry and Labor,” councils of conciliation made up of employers and employed. These councils have no legal standing as boards of arbitration. They are rather

standing committees of negotiation. In France they have done good service, and they are certainly an advance on "Strike Committees," hastily appointed in times of excitement. Just now the tendency is to co-operation, or some like form of corporate organization. To meet this tendency the commission reported in favor of liberty of corporate financial association.

Following Germany, though at a long distance, the commission brought in a law for the assurance of workingmen. Assurance is made obligatory, but the State takes no responsibility upon itself. The system is carried out by means of syndicates of workingmen and employers; the State does not guarantee the operations of the syndicates. Giving an impetus to a system which she assumes to be necessary under the present conditions, the State leaves the working of the system wholly to those who are directly interested in it; and here at least avoids the dangers of Bismarckian State Socialism.

Alcoholism is bad, but at its worst it is not so hurtful to society as "free love." The European laws that were made long ago to meet other social conditions are largely to blame for the debasing and mischievous system of concubinage which has developed among all classes, but especially among the workingmen. In Belgium, as in France, the law forbade a man to marry before his twenty-fifth year without the consent of his parents or guardians. And, in addition, the law had encumbered the ceremony of marriage with a number of costly formalities. Official inquiries made in France, as well as in Belgium, have proved that to these restraints on lawful marriage the prevalent habit of temporary unions is in good part chargeable. Outside of any question of morals the State has necessarily a deep interest in the regularity and permanence of the marriage tie. On this depends the very existence of the State. The Belgian Commission, having traced the social cause of the evil, promptly reported the facts, and the necessary conclusions; and Woeste, the brave supporter of Malou and Jacobs, as good a deputy as minister, promptly brought in a bill doing away with the old-time requirements as to age and parental authority, and obliging the municipalities to furnish free of charge all the papers requisite for a legal marriage, where the parties to the contract were unable to bear the expense. Liberality in the matter of documents is vastly more commendable than liberalism in the more intimate relations of the sexes.

The commission has dealt with many other details of the actual social life of Belgium. It has presented valuable reports on questions not as yet touched by legislation, and it is still engaged in studying the immediate needs of society, with a view to the future

as well as to the present welfare of the people.<sup>1</sup> The Belgian Radical revolutionaries did not look with favor on the appointment of the commission; nor were they pleased with the reforms it so promptly introduced. Peace and concord form no part of the creed of Belgian Liberals, Radicals, Socialists, or Anarchists. At first they sought to prevent the workingmen from going before the commission to testify as to their grievances and their real condition. There were, though, enough of sensible, law-abiding men to make the Radical scheme a failure. Then, as usual, an appeal was made to force—the strike and the riot. On January 16th, 1887, the miners at Charleroi struck. In February a committee met and voted to order a general strike. No more was heard of this decision until the middle of March, when the miners and quarrymen in certain sections stopped work. These strikes lasted only a few weeks, however. In May the movement showed new life. The colliers began; the metal workers followed. Then the mechanics and others in the towns, and especially in Ghent, Louvain, and Brussels, lent a hand. The cry was for universal suffrage and amnesty to the convicted rioters of 1886. The true source and motive of the strikes was made plain by the address of the Workmen's League at Charleroi, which invited the support of the electors on the ground that the strike was essentially political. The old tactics were followed with some slight modern improvements. Of course, the gendarmes were handled roughly, the revolver played its usual part, and dynamite was freely used to destroy bridges and private property, and even to kill "brothers" who would not join the strikers. The German and French Anarchists were on the ground, as cheery, and charitable, and crack-brained as ever. They recommended that all industrial establishments should be blown sky-high. On May 26th the Committee on General Strike made a bold move. They sent a letter to Premier Bernaert notifying him that if, by the 29th of the month, he had not decided to adopt universal suffrage, dissolve the Chambers, and call a Constituent Assembly, he alone would have to bear the responsibility for whatever calamities might occur. Meantime a Radical Congress gathered in Brussels, and on that fatal day, the 29th, they debated the question of universal suffrage. A resolu-

---

<sup>1</sup> To M. Claudio Jannet's articles, *Les Faits Économiques et le Mouvement Social*, which have appeared from time to time in *Le Correspondant*, the writer is indebted for certain details concerning the reports of this Commission. Temperately discussing, as they do, every phase of the economic and social movements of the day, these articles are of the highest value. A translation of them would be of real service to American workingmen and employers.



tion favoring it was voted down. The largest suffrage the Radicals were willing to give was an educational suffrage—a very conservative suffrage indeed. The bubble was pricked. Within a few days it had collapsed. The strikers returned to work, and partial peace reigned. Since that time there have been occasional local disturbances, but no organized general movement. When it was evident that the agitators had given up the fight, the Government showed its policy towards the rioters of 1886. As might be expected, it was a policy of moderation. On November 8th the Minister of Justice announced that the Ministry purposed a large exercise of clemency in favor of the men convicted as rioters in 1886. The extent of this measure appeared in the royal decree of December 4th, by which the terms of imprisonment of a number of the guilty parties were reduced about two-thirds.

While patiently, prudently, courageously laboring for the liberty of the citizens and internal peace, the Conservative-Catholic Ministry has been as careful of the defence of the country against external enemies. The geographical position of Belgium, bordering on the two unfriendly powers, France and Germany, renders her liable to invasion at any moment. The smallness of her population, as well as of her army, makes it evident that, if she is to preserve her neutrality in case of war, and to hinder her two warlike neighbors from turning Belgium into a frightful battle-ground, she must be protected by a strong system of fortifications. In his instructive articles on the present European military conditions, Sir Charles Dilke pointed out Belgium's dangers and her weak points. The Bernaert Ministry saw the one and the other, and at an early day took up the subject of the country's defence. After careful consultation with high military authorities, the Minister of War designed a plan of fortifications along the Meuse, intended to secure the country from invasion on the French side, where it was peculiarly exposed. When the Government's proposal was submitted to the Chamber of Deputies it met with a strong opposition from the Radical-Liberals under Frère-Orban. To explain this unpatriotic opposition is not easy. One would hesitate before charging the Radical-Liberals with a desire to expose the country to French invasion. However, the opposition was fruitless. On June 14th, 1887, the Chamber of Deputies passed the Government bill. The Senate approved it on the 24th of the same month. By this time the great work is well on the way to completion. Measures have been taken to arm these forts with the best modern cannon; and the country will soon have the satisfaction of feeling that should either Germany or France force a way into Belgian territory it will not be chargeable to Belgian neglect. The importance

of these fortifications along the Meuse is confirmed by the foreign telegrams of the month of October, 1888. The French press denounces them as "excessive measures of defence." Madame J. Adam, who knows everything, charges that there is a secret treaty between the King of the Belgians and Bismarck as against France. There are rumors that the French Government "will soon present a note to the Belgian Government expressing surprise that, being assured that its neutrality would be respected in the event of a Continental war, Belgium should take such precautions." Anonymous French staff-officers are writing letters to the press showing how unlikely it is that the Germans will want to attack France by way of Belgium, and how certain it is that France would not think of doing what Germany cannot be thinking of doing. Evidently the French would prefer to have the line of the Meuse open, or else they are busy strengthening some distant part of their own territory. And evidently the fortification of the Meuse was not begun a day too early, and cannot be finished a day too soon.

In this review of the internal and external policy of the present Conservative-Catholic Government of Belgium, we have omitted many subjects of more or less interest to the student of modern political or social life. But the world runs so fast that whoever would deal critically with four years of government in the smallest of countries must needs write a book, and not an article. The course of Belgian affairs tells more of hope and suggestion to the lovers of liberty, moderation, prudence, justice, peace and practical politics than that of any other European nationality. Rightly the world should have but two parties: the party of liberty and progress, and the party of tyranny and retrogression. In the former party all the Christian elements of society would be joined, had reason or the spirit of Christianity, or even plain interest, full sway. As it is, they are divided by supposed interests, petty interests of denomination, dynasties, clubs and cliques. Were not the French royalists and imperialists of all shades so greatly exercised about corpses, living and dead, and about words that have ceased to have a meaning, true liberty would have made vast strides in France during the last quarter of a century, and the country would not now be compelled to consider a revision of the Constitution in the interest of persons rather than of ideas. Italians have been bound hand and foot by a policy whose wisdom it is not allowed to question, but which, for the time being, has been a trying one for the friends of good government and the largest freedom. Let us hope that when diplomacy has solved the "Roman Question"—and it must in time solve it, unless European Governments are anxious that the Italian people shall, like the Irish, take

matters into their own vigorous hands—the sons of the men who suffered so much to free their country from the grasp of the foreigner, and who fought in the field and the forum for a unity of hearts, regardless of royal dynasties, may have learned from Belgium how to use wisely the government that must come under their direction, and how to accommodate themselves to realities. The sacrifice of principle can never be a question where the men who lead have only the public weal at heart. Four years of Conservative-Catholic Government in Belgium have made this clear. To-day every individual or group that favors peace, material progress, moral well-doing, freedom and independence, stands firmly by the Catholic-Conservative Government. And the Government has been careful to recognize this fact. It has a right measure of the country and the times. When in October, 1887, Thonissen resigned from the Ministry, warned by the weight of years, and anxious to finish his long-contemplated history of the criminal law before death had stopped him, the Ministry filled his place with a young lawyer, M. Lejeune, who was known as a moderate Liberal. In the work of African civilization, which now moves all foreign governments, partly from a spirit of civilization, partly from a spirit of enterprise, and not a little from a spirit of greed, Belgium has taken a leading part. Her king has been officially authorized to assume the Presidency of the Congo State, but Belgium has assumed no responsibility for the venture. Without seeking purely selfish interests, she has pointed and led the way of civilization.

Here, in the United States, the old spirit of liberty is strong. By father and son it has been nourished, cherished, North and South, East and West. But the spirit of disorder, intolerance, illiberality, force, irreligion, socialism, revolution, anarchy, grows too rapidly year by year. Counter to these harmful notions, encouraged by them, the no less fatal doctrines of centralization are making headway. Are Christians here to learn nothing from the past or the present? Are they ready to sacrifice liberty, decency, religion, the future realization of the highest of human hopes and aspirations, on the altar of sectarian prejudices and foreign spites? Seeking little things, will they lose their hold on the great things for which their fathers prayed and suffered? Surely not. Let them lift themselves beyond the narrow bounds that limit religious and national prejudices, in great part the result of imperfect education and the hypocritical, selfish efforts of parasites and designing politicians; let them seek the ground of unity, and not the line of certain division; let there be mutual sacrifice or independence in things not essential, but in essential things, where personal liberty,



common morality, the Ten Commandments, justice between individuals, are at stake, let there be unity.

To Catholics, as well as non-Catholics, the way of unity and the right method of dealing with the political and social questions of the hour have been pointed out by the Catholic-Conservative party of Belgium. In this little country the lovers of true freedom could rightly set up a statue of Liberty enlightening the world.

We should not, however, pin our faith to any party or country. The difficulties of a party really begin only when the country has shown its full confidence in certain men and measures. Then ambitions, baser interests, jobbery, and the imaginings of the *doctrinaire* begin to be felt. Large majorities create a sense of security and a spirit of carelessness which in time lead to division, harmful compromise, or positive wrong. Judging the present Belgian Ministry by its past, we may have confidence in its integrity of purpose, wide vision and patriotism; but time alone can tell what obstacles the makers of the new era may meet with from the men who now give them the most cordial support. Whatever the future, and there is every reason to have a still larger hope, let us learn the good lessons which the last four years of Belgian politics have taught all fair men who are willing to learn.

---

## BOSTONIAN IGNORANCE OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

POPULAR agitation against Catholics in the United States seems to mark the years with double numbers, such as 1833, 1844, 1855, and that which has just expired has done something to merit a place in the category. The agitation of 1833 culminated in the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown by a mob, and it is strange that, in half a century of progress, the most enlightened city in the country still shows to the world that, in fifty years, it has learned nothing in some departments of human knowledge, and has thousands still slaves of ignorant prejudice, ready to be swayed and led on by fanatical appeals. The good people of Boston know a great deal more about electricity, early Greek art, the site of Troy, Egyptian antiquities, the mineral resources of America, methods of manufacture, than they did fifty years ago; but in regard to the Catholic Church, its organization, doctrines, worship and polity, they seem not to have learned an iota. And what is true of that city, which boasts of its superior culture, is true of many other places.

The intellectual attitude of the mass of non-Catholics towards us is one of the most curious problems in the world. When Catholics were few in this country, and foreign travel uncommon; when the Catholic religion was believed to be something that flourished in the Middle Ages, and disappeared in modern times; when, as a Lord Chancellor of England, once, putting the whole matter for that country, declared that Catholics, in the eye of the law, were not supposed to exist in England, one could understand to some extent that all knowledge about them might be supposed to lurk only among learned professors in colleges who studied the matter up in order to obtain a definite idea of the European nations during the Middle Ages; but when every large city has, in its churches, colleges, schools and charitable institutions, evidences that Catholicity is an actual and active reality; when town and village show the same in proportion, it is amazing beyond conception that people will wallow in ignorance, or rest on the narrow circle of old wives' tales handed down by prejudice, rather than examine for themselves. Although Catholic books and periodicals can be had on all sides, they are never examined; no effort is made to acquire information. Indeed, in many minds there is the latent, if unexpressed, idea that Catholic books are imbued with a kind of witchcraft; that they have some subtle power that blinds a person to

his better judgment if he touches them, and convinces him against his will and his reason.

Nearly fifty years ago Catholics in New York, who had been deprived, for no fault of theirs, of a share of the school money, asked its restoration, showing that in the schools of the Public School Society, a private corporation which enjoyed the monopoly, there were books and teaching so imbued with hostility or contempt for Catholics that they could not send their children to them. The Protestant clergy rallied to the support of the School Society, every old charge possible was revived against Catholics, and a new one, utterly false, that Catholics had asked to have the Bible banished from the schools, became a stock accusation, maintained to this day, and which still finds dupes to believe it.

So, this year, in Boston, an American priest called the attention of the School Board to a misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine by a teacher. That gentleman fell back on a history used in the schools, and continued to present his views of Catholic doctrine in more and more offensive forms, till the Board struck the book from the list and assigned the teacher to another department. Then, as fifty years ago, numbers of Protestant clergymen who, not without good grounds, consider the public schools part of their system and property, began a vehement campaign against the Catholic religion, denouncing it, and all who adhered to it, in every possible form. Many of the leading newspapers aided the onslaught. The whole matter became a political issue, and even women were stimulated to rush to the polls to save their religion, if not their lives and homes. And, in fact, they voted by thousands, knowing as little as the men what the merits of the case really were. If it has been right that Protestants should have exclusive control of the public schools, as they have had these many years, it must be equally right for Catholics to do the same when they can. A Protestant journal says: "It is abominable that this very denomination should be at the same time struggling to get control of their management, their text-books, and their teachers." If the control by Catholics would be abominable, that by Protestants must be, if both are citizens with equal rights.

What an indulgence is, as taught by the Catholic Church, could be as easily ascertained as what an electric dynamo is. The Catholic Church is an institution existing throughout the world. It has the decrees of Councils, defining its faith. It has dogmatic and catechetical works for the ordinary guidance of its priesthood and the instruction of the faithful. Any person of common sense would say: Let us examine these and take the definitions given there. But people of common sense seem few in number. Objections are made that the books used by Catholics in this country



are adapted for Protestant countries, yet books printed in Catholic countries might readily be had. If others averred that doctrines had changed, and that, in former times, different definitions were given, and different ideas and practices prevailed, still the fact remains that printing was invented in Catholic times, and that for more than half a century before Protestantism arose, and down to this time, presses have teemed with Catholic books. It would be the easiest thing in the world for any great library, like Harvard, to make a collection of Catholic books, showing what indulgences were held to be, at all times, and in all countries, from the invention of printing to the present time. This would be the best primary evidence on that point, as a collection of missals would be of the form of the liturgy during that period.

Yet, in all that was written, said and printed during the heated discussion in Boston, no one seems to have taken this plain, common-sense way of ascertaining what Catholics hold an indulgence to be.

There are quaint little handbooks, like DeBurgo's *Fupilla Oculi*, 1510; the *Discipulus de Eruditione Christi Fidelium*, 1504; *Manipulus Clericorum*, 1530, printed for the use of the parochial clergy in England, France and Germany, which would afford any really honest inquirer a knowledge of what doctrine was then actually taught the people from the pulpit; but it is useless even to expect any such intelligent examination. Catholics puzzled at the mental phenomenon of intelligent people preferring darkness to light, and error to truth, can only pray that God would "take away the veil from their hearts."

The result of the Boston agitation was not commensurate with the energy expended. With the pulpit and press inciting the people, with women summoned to the polls, the effect was slight compared to other days. "Sometimes a convent, then a church we burn," did not hold good; but by almost superhuman exertion they succeeded in defeating a Catholic gentleman, who, after holding the office of Mayor of Boston for four terms, a duration well-nigh unexampled in the municipal history of that city, was defeated when a candidate for the fifth time; and they gave one more proof of the essentially Protestant character of the public schools by preventing the election of any Catholic to the School Board. As these same people are complaining of Catholics for withdrawing their children from the public schools, it was rather unwise to make their anti-Catholic spirit and management so distinctly apparent.

The spirit of hostility to the Church, which showed itself fifty or sixty years ago in the violence committed by the poor misguided dupes of men who should have known better, and had

hearts to teach them better, still prevails, and on occasion can be roused, but it is less generally diffused, and is diminishing in intensity. The sermons of 1888 led to none of the crimes caused by those of earlier days.

Protestantism is losing its hold even in New England. The population of Colonial stock are dwindling in numbers, and the churches show a decline greater even than proportionate numerical loss. The young rarely become church members, the Sunday School and Young Men's Christian Associations seem to supplant rather than aid the churches. Protestantism never was a religion, nor had the elements of one. It has no priesthood, no settled dogma, no essential act of divine worship. In our times the cold Calvinistic church service repels, as the Episcopal, with its new trappings, its vestments, its light, its spirit of gladness, seems to attract Protestants. The Methodists and Baptists have outlived their early energy. The decline is so distinctly felt that recruits for the ministry are few. Zealous men are studying and devising how to draw promising young men to the ministry; but no result has been reached. In many parts, especially in New England, where churches formerly had a large membership, it has dwindled so that they cannot secure ministers. There have been conventions to know what is to be done to save these churches. Where they are of the same denomination, congregations can unite, and so defer for a time the imminent dissolution. But in many cases there are four or five churches in a little town, each belonging to a different organization. "A township of 5000 population seldom has more than three churches," says a Protestant paper, "*one of which is Roman Catholic, and is always well filled*, and these churches will not seat more than 1200. The number of people at all the churches on any Sunday morning is scarcely 600." Schemes for a union of denominations have been taken up, and there is a journal, *The Church Union*, especially devoted to advocating such a blending together. The International Bible Lesson for Sunday Schools tends that way, and on Thanksgiving Day, which, in the memory of living men, saw every Protestant church well filled, it is now usual in many places to hold a union service; the most eloquent minister is selected, and he can barely fill one church, while several others are closed and empty. But effectual union is prevented by many minor causes, that of church-property not being the least. The questions of doctrine, church government and form of service present great difficulties; not a denomination has any for which any positive authority can be shown, but each clings to its own, as though a matter of positive divine revelation. With all the labor to effect a union, not a step has been gained, not even the different bodies of a single denomination have been

brought together. "You have had your Evangelical Alliance for nearly fifty years, you have had your famous Pan-Presbyterian Alliance for at least twelve years," wrote Rev. Dr. Dabney, when he proceeded to show that they had effected absolutely nothing. Meanwhile, the gradual disintegration goes on. So far as the Catholic Church is concerned, any union between it and the sects that have separated from it, and from each other, has, of course, become impossible. Men like Fénelon, Leibnitz, Bishop Doyle, believed it practicable, in their day, but what might have been possible in the seventeenth century, is no longer so.

There is a remarkable difference between the earlier Oriental heresies and those of the West now embodied in Protestantism. The former turned almost entirely on questions relating to our Lord; but each body, as formed apart from the Church, retained a hierarchy, priesthood, the Mass as the only sacrifice or public divine worship of the New Law, the sacraments and most Catholic practices. The Greek schism touched the Papacy as the continuous headship of Peter. For all or any of these bodies to unite with the Catholic Church again, required but little. If any body, like the Eutychians recently, who, after being fourteen centuries out of the Church, formally disavows, by an authoritative act, the particular heretical doctrine it has held, it comes back with its apostolic succession, valid orders, Mass and sacraments. All goes on externally as before, but they are Catholics. Even the Greek Church in Russia, Greece and Turkey could, by a simple act recognizing the supremacy of the Pope, restore millions upon millions to the unity of faith. It would require no change in the form of church government, or in the Mass, or in the administration of the sacraments, and very little even in the doctrinal teaching.

But the Protestant movement carried with it few bishops, and abandoned necessarily the priesthood and the Mass. It has no episcopate with apostolic succession, no duly ordained priesthood, no sacrifice of the New Law, and now virtually no sacraments, even if there were those who could validly administer them. There is nothing on their side by which a union can be effected. They are mere secessionists, and to come back to the union must acknowledge the general government of the Church and its organization. They have not kept for three centuries what the Eutychians did for fourteen, but must recover it all, and that cannot be done without, but only within the Church. No Protestant body can come into the Church, though individuals can and do.

Providence is shaping events so that even in New England the faith is gaining a firm hold that would have been deemed impossible a few years ago. The fact that Boston has at four successive



elections chosen an Irish Catholic for Mayor; that in the School Board of that city there are even now eight Catholic members, shows a large Catholic body and influence in Boston; the more so as Catholic energy centring on the erection and maintenance of parochial schools, our people generally have come to the conviction that no really just and fair system of public schools is possible, and that the best devised system would constantly be made an instrument of oppression. Hence their interest in the public schools has decreased; they leave them to their fellow-citizens of other beliefs and unbeliefs.

The growth of the Catholic body in New England, by natural increase, by immigration from Europe and the descendants of more recent incomers, and by the wonderful influx of French Canadians who came at first merely as denizens, but now remain, become citizens and settle down to make the land their home. They have able leaders like Gagnon, their literary associations, priests, churches, convents, schools, they are bilingual, speaking both French and English, and increase rather than diminish the influence of their brethren in Canada. A recent estimate fixes the number of French Canadians in the United States at 800,000, five hundred thousand in New York and New England.

The whole Catholic population of New England by the latest data is, in Maine, 70,000; New Hampshire, so long bitterly hostile to Catholics, 73,000; Vermont, 50,000; Massachusetts, 715,000; Rhode Island, 150,000; Connecticut, 175,000; a total of 1,248,000 in a population of 4,000,000 in 1880. In Rhode Island the Catholic population is fully half that of the State; in Connecticut  $\frac{7}{8}$ ths; in Massachusetts,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ths; the rate in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont is smaller, ranging from one-fifth to one-ninth.

Now, supposing all Catholic immigration to cease, the Catholic gain would be steady. Of 6638 children born alive in New Hampshire, 2410, or four out of every eleven, were baptized in Catholic churches; in Vermont, 2235 out of 7350 born alive; in Massachusetts, 28,000 out of 42,735, fully two-thirds; and in large cities like Boston the Catholic baptisms have for many years exceeded half the number of children born. The births in Boston in 1887 numbered 12,137, while the Catholic baptisms were 7382, showing that more than half the new native population of that city is Catholic and of Catholic parentage. This proportion is all the more striking, as within a few years suburban towns of old Puritanic origin have been brought within the city limits. So, in Bridgeport, Connecticut, three Catholic churches, in 1887, baptized 463; in Manchester, N. H., of 1390 children born, 930 were baptized in Catholic Churches. In Connecticut it is 6700 out of 14,027, or nearly half, and in Rhode Island 3602 out of 6798, or more

than half. Taking all New England together, of 77,548 children born alive, at least 43,000 were baptized in Catholic churches. The Catholic body would, therefore, independent of all accessions by immigration from Europe or Canada, gain steadily. It is a common delusion that the majority of Catholics in the United States are of foreign birth. It was not so at the Revolution, and cannot be proved to have been so at any period. In 1880 the foreign-born population was some 6,300,000; the Catholic body numbered 7,500,000; and not more than half the foreign born can be regarded as Catholic; even allowing 3,500,000 as their number, this would leave 4,000,000 native-born Catholics in the country.

As the Catholic births far exceed the general average of the country, this native body is growing at the rate of 250,000 a year.

Let us consider New England under another phase.

Place some of the old Puritan Fathers in Boston and other New England towns to-day. Irish Catholics, whom Ward, one of their ministers, characterized in his "Simple Cobbler of Aggawam" as "Bots of the Beast's Tail," would be seen by them filling the land with their descendants; Catholics of Portuguese origin, almost as hateful as Irish, swarm in all the fishing towns; German Catholics are found everywhere; the Catholics of Canada, for whose annihilation the old Puritan pulpits so constantly rang with appeals that every wall echoed them, now pour down like an irresistible torrent on their New England, conquered but conquering in turn. The Puritans of olden days would be appalled; but they would go to the meeting-houses to revive their spirits and the old religious ideas which they had founded. Here, surely, they would expect consolation and relief. They strenuously taught the doctrine of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement, Baptismal Regeneration, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Church as the kingdom of God and a power in a Christian commonwealth; they believed in a Christian education of the young, and from the very primer where their little ones learned their letters they imbued them with these vital doctrines. But in the meeting-houses of to-day they would hear all these things ignored or derided and denied; and if they spoke of religious education in the schools, they would be crushed with sarcasm, taunt, ridicule and pretentious arrogance. They would leave the meeting-houses with sad and heavy hearts, and, looking up at cross-crowned spires, would gnash their teeth and regard the evil result as the work of these Catholic intruders who had come into their fair heritage. But, if mustering courage they entered the Catholic churches, what would be their amazement to hear every one of these doctrines boldly, fearlessly and plainly taught; they would see men called to adore the Holy Trinity, to look up to Jesus

Christ as our Redeemer, making atonement for us, wiping away original sin; they would hear the Scriptures read as the inspired word of God, not put on a level with the Zendavesta and the Koran; they would hear of baptismal regeneration, and constantly and steadily would hear the necessity inculcated of blending religion with education from the first dawn of reason. Would they not in utter amazement cast up their hands and cry: *Ergo erravimus?* "Therefore we have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice has not shined unto us:" "These are they, whom we had some time in derision, and for a parable of reproach." "Behold how they are numbered among the children of God."

They would turn from their degenerate descendants and admit that the house they had erected was built on sand, and that Christian hope was in the Catholic Church.

In sober reality such Christian truths as were taught in New England in old Puritan days are now taught there distinctly only by the Catholic Church. It is really continuing the work of the old Puritans.

Anti-Catholic prejudice has outlived the doctrines of the Protestant churches in New England and throughout the country. Secular education has bred a dry rot on the churches, and they are sensibly decaying. There is zeal in Sunday-schools, but these institutions, while made so as to attract and interest children, do not lead them to love and take part in the church service; they simply replace it for the young who, after growing up in Sunday-schools, are virtually strangers to the church, and find nothing there to interest them. It is as if our children were taught their catechism, but were never taken to Mass, and allowed to grow up ignorant of it and its meaning and consolations. As a matter of course, few would attend it.

In 1888 the anti-Catholic movement rose and fell in Boston; but did not spread through the country, although the old Know-Nothing organization has been revived and is active, with papers in several parts especially devoted to their cause; but every year the increasing numbers and influence of Catholics render their efforts less and less hurtful to the country. It will never again put a Presidential candidate in the field, but confine itself to underhand working in order to defeat an obnoxious candidate put forward by one of the two great parties, or beset enough Senators to prevent the confirmation of some Catholic nominated by the President.

The war on the parochial schools begun in Massachusetts may be revived and imitated elsewhere, but this seems scarcely probable. It failed in the first grand onset, and it will not be easy to rally the same strength again.



To all appearance the periodical attack on the Catholic body has passed, and if it is renewed in the last year of the century, it will, so far as human foresight can estimate the future, be feeble indeed, for the Catholic body, numbering twenty-five out of seventy-five millions, will be too respectable a minority to be easily crushed.

When we consider that Congregationalism was once not only the dominant, but actually the State Church in all parts of New England except Rhode Island, the refuge of the Baptists, the status of Congregationalism, as shown by the census of 1880, is perfectly amazing, in the decline which it shows. In Massachusetts, its very heart and centre, the descendants of the Separatists and Puritans have so fallen away from the faith and church of their ancestors, that only 91,787, or 5 per cent. of a population of 1,783,012 were members of the Congregational Church. In Connecticut, where Yale College did so much to save them, there were, indeed, 55,852, or 9 per cent. of the whole population; New Hampshire Congregational churches could boast of 20,547 members, being 6 per cent. of the population, and Vermont 20,117, being the same proportion. In Maine, so long an appendage of Massachusetts, there were 21,645 members of Congregational churches, barely  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. while the Methodists had 25,883 members, and the Baptists 21,165. The decline in Rhode Island amongst its dominant denomination was as marked, for, in a population of 276,528, the Baptist churches had only 10,839 members, about 4 per cent. of the population.

The evidence is unmistakable that the young people growing up do not and will not become members of the Protestant churches.

In other words, allowing for those under twelve years of age, at least 75 out of every 100 no longer regard the ordinances of the Congregational church as at all necessary means to aid them to save their souls. To the question: "What shall I do to be saved?" they will not take as an answer: "Become church-members."

---

## PROGRESS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARNELL COMMISSION.

THE Parnell Commission may be taken as a test and illustration of the condition of Ireland. It is the encysted ganglion of the national disease at present. To dissect this tumor will show the method of the malady.

The Commission, though still current, may fairly be judged by its progress from its first meeting, on September 17th, to its adjournment for a month on December 20th. In this time the Commission had thirty-one sittings. A review of the proceedings will compel opinion as to whether or not the *London Times* has cleared itself of the dreadful suspicion of publishing forged letters designed to ruin Mr. Parnell, and also whether the Tory Government is justified in using the Commission to parade a mass of alleged Irish crime and "outrage" which has no relation to Mr. Parnell or the charges of the *Times* against him.

Early in July last a libel suit was decided in London which had been brought against the *London Times* by a man named Frank Hugh O'Donnell, a writer in a London Tory paper, who had been a Home Rule member of Parliament. O'Donnell, however, had long ago earned the thorough distrust and dislike of the whole body of Irish representatives, and had been rejected as one of their number.

The *Times* had at this time adopted a system of making offensive and even criminal charges against members of the Irish party in Parliament and daring them to take action for libel.

A year and a half ago the *Times* published a letter bearing Mr. Parnell's signature, and dated May 15th, 1882, addressed to Mr. Patrick Egan, showing a complicity in the assassinations by "the Invincibles," the society to which James Carey, the informer, belonged, and for the deeds of which several men were executed in that year. This letter was so flagrant a forgery, even to the eye, but more so to the common sense, that it fell flat even in England, and produced an effect directly contrary to the wish and purpose of the *Times*. In Ireland and America it was universally referred to as "the *Times* forgery," and was received with ridicule.

Mr. Parnell took no notice of the slander, nor of the angry challenges of the *Times* to "come into court and defend yourself."

It was not understood then (to any but the Irish members, probably) that the *Times* actually relied on the prejudices or dis-

honesty of English judges and jurors to come off without a penalty; but the formation and action of the Special Commission now in existence establishes a startling connivance between the Government and the libelling paper.

When Mr. Parnell and his associates were thus leaving the *Times* alone, and winning by their forbearance, a bogus action for libel was begun against the *Times* by the above-named O'Donnell. In this action O'Donnell made almost no pretence of supporting a case; he went just far enough to allow the counsel for the *Times* (the Attorney-General of England) to make a speech of injurious import against the Nationalist party, renewing all the *Times'* libels, and producing in court a heap of documents used to prove that the Irish National League was an association for the manufacture of outrage and crime, that it had instigated the Phoenix Park murders, and that Mr. Parnell was cognizant of its evil doings.

Among these papers was a letter alleged to be in Mr. Parnell's handwriting, and to have been smuggled from Kilmainham jail, addressed to Patrick Egan, saying :

"What are these fellows waiting for? Inaction is inexpedient. Our best men are in prison. Nothing has been done. End this hesitancy. Make it hot for old Forster."

Other letters were produced tending to show that Mr. Parnell had assisted Mr. Byrne, an alleged Invincible, to escape, and that he had maintained communication with and received money from Mr. Egan and others, who were alleged to be criminals.

On the conclusion of the Attorney-General's speech, the Lord Chief-Justice charged strongly, against O'Donnell, of course, and a verdict was given for the *Times*. Thereupon a still louder outcry arose—this time from other Tory papers besides the *Times*—to Mr. Parnell to "come into court" and defend his character.

Mr. Parnell, on the day following, arose in Parliament and denounced as absolute forgeries the letters with his signature published in the *Times* and read in court by the Attorney-General. The letter dated May 15, 1882, had his signature in a form he had not attached to a letter since 1879, when he had adopted, for special reasons, a different style. "The great majority of the letters read at the trial," Mr. Parnell continued, "are palpable forgeries. If they are credited it must be supposed that I deliberately put myself in the power of a murderer; that I was accessory to the Phoenix Park murders before and after the fact, and that I entered Kilmainham jail desiring to assassinate Mr. Forster. The absurdity of the whole series of letters, with a few exceptions, shows them to be forgeries."

Mr. Egan cabled from America that the letters were forgeries, and offered to go to England and prove it if he were promised protection.



Still the *Times* cried out that Mr. Parnell was bound to "come into court." But other great English papers accepted the Irish leader's dignified word as conclusive proof that he had been foully slandered. The *Daily News* summed up a powerful leader with these words:

"Mr. Parnell's plain and frank words effectually dispose of the absurd charges made against him by dupes and partisans. He has done his duty by exploding before the House of Commons and the country fictions which would scarcely have deceived a well-regulated nursery."

And then the tide turned for a time, and set in favor of the Home Rulers, the first wave splashing dismay in the faces of *Times* and Tories.

This first wave was a question by Sir Frederick Lawson, an English Home Ruler, asking whether or not the Government would appoint a Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the charges made against the Irish Nationalist members. Mr. Parnell followed with a direct motion for the appointment of such a Committee, and asked the Government to appoint a day to discuss the subject and give him an opportunity "to repel the foul and unfounded charges made against him by Attorney-General Webster in the trial of the suit of Mr. O'Donnell against the *Times*."

In reply, the Government, through its leader, Mr. W. H. Smith, declined to give a day for the discussion, and also declined to appoint a Committee of Inquiry.

This action of the Government created a strong feeling in favor of Mr. Parnell; and the Tory Government rapidly learned that a step had been taken that must be recalled. Accordingly, a few days later, the Government leader, Mr. Smith, introduced a motion proposing, not a Parliamentary inquiry, which would be at least open and general, but a Special Commission, to be composed of three judges—appointed by the Government.

Weeks of heated discussion followed the announcement, which was soon backed up by another to the effect that the three judges were to have power to inquire into all kinds of crime in Ireland, whether or not connected with the *Times'* charges against the Irish members.

The judges selected by the Government, Hannen, Day and Smith, were objectionable, two of them being pronouncedly anti-Irish, one of the two, Justice Day, being a notorious hater of the Irish people and their National movement. An English member, a man of national repute, a leading London journalist (Labouchere), declared that Judge Day was unfit to serve on the Commission, "because in a recent trial of three Irishmen for assault, held in Liverpool, Justice Day had said that such a dastardly, cowardly and brutal crime could not have happened in England, except among the Irish."

Mr. Parnell, moved by a patriotic spirit, foreseeing danger to his country, urged the House to recollect that they were discussing a proposal to provide a substitute for the jury. "While in England a jury of twelve was always provided, it was proposed that the settlement of an important, far-reaching Irish issue be involved in an inquiry to depend upon the verdict of two men."

An eminent English member, Mr. John Morley, perhaps the first Liberal in the country in influence, after Mr. Gladstone, created a sensation by saying that "a gentleman having peculiar means of knowing Justice Day's mind upon Irish affairs" had written informing him that he (Justice Day) was "like Torquemada, a Tory of the high-flyer, non-juror type; that he nightly railed against Mr. Parnell and his friends; that he regarded them as infidels and rebels; that he believed them guilty of any crime." There were loud cries of "name!" and Mr. Morley named his informant—an eminent colleague of Justice Day's on the Belfast Riot Commission. "Surely," concluded Mr. Morley, "in the face of a feeling of this kind toward Justice Day, the Government will not retain him on the Commission, against which there ought to be no whisper raised."

Mr. Parnell earnestly urged that the Government could no longer plead ignorance in regard to a Commission composed of two Conservatives and one Unionist. "The world would know to-morrow," he said, "that the Government's idea of fairness was that the Nationalists should be tried by a jury of three English political opponents."

But the Government had picked their men, and meant to stick to them, for their own purposes; and as they had the votes, these three judges were appointed as the Special Commission.

Then followed a hopeless fight, joined in by English Liberals side by side with Irish Home Rulers, to compel or induce the Government to limit the scope of the inquiry into the charges of the *Times* and its alleged Parnell letters. In the course of this discussion occurred the now historical castigation of Joseph Chamberlain by Parnell, and the first application of the title "Judas" to Mr. Chamberlain by T. P. O'Connor. Mr. Parnell's scourge was drawn in comment on some suggestion made by Chamberlain. He said:

"My recollection of Mr. Chamberlain is that before he was a Minister he was always anxious to put the Irish party forward to do the work which he himself was afraid to do. After he became Minister he was always most anxious to betray to the Irish party the secrets of the Cabinet, and to endeavor while in the Cabinet to undermine their councils and plans in the interest of the Irish party. If the inquiry be extended to these matters I shall be able to make good my words by documentary and other evidence—that has not been forged."

The ensuing discussion, to limit the scope of the inquiry to direct charges, is of much importance, as it shows what the result was intended by the Government to be, and illumines the purpose of the Commission in hearing all kinds of evidence retailing stories of crime or conspiracy in Ireland.

Mr. Sexton, pungent as usual, directly charged that the Government leader, Mr. Smith, was in league with the *Times'* editor, Mr. Walter, and that the funds and machinery of the national treasury were at the disposal of the *Times*. Mr. Sexton said :

“Walter at first did not wish that other persons should be included in the investigation, but when he visited Mr. Smith he knew that the letters he had published in the *Times* would be proved to be forgeries, that his charges against members would break down, and that the only chance he had of escaping disgrace and the ruin of the *Times* was to get a roving inquiry into the conduct of persons over whom members had no control, and thus mislead the public mind.”

This clear opinion was an actual foresight of what is likely to happen and has already happened. The Government, confident of its majority, made little show of defending its motive or intent, but sullenly sat and waited for the vote, taking the scorn and argument of Liberals and Home Rulers with the same stolid indifference. They refused, by a party vote, to have the Parnell letters specially inquired into. The motion had been made by an English member. “It now appears,” said the caustic Sir Wm. Vernon Harcourt, ex-Home Secretary, “that the Government’s object in creating the Commission was not to give the Irish members an opportunity to clear themselves of foul and calumnious charges, but to inquire into a political organization—not to clear, but to blacken, the characters of the Nationalists.”

But the Government had its purpose settled; the closure was applied to stop further suggestion or exposure; the Irish members walked out of the House in a body—and the bill was passed.

Then Mr. Parnell entered suit in the Scottish Courts against the London *Times*, claiming £50,000 damages on account of the forged letters. The *Times*, frightened at the first show of retaliation, tried to evade the legal test, after all its loud challenges to “come into court,” and urged that the Scottish Courts had no jurisdiction. This was overruled, and the trial is proceeding in Scotland by law at the same time that it progresses in England by the arbitrary will of three partisan judges.

The first result of the Commission was a national and international movement to raise money for the defence of Mr. Parnell. It was recognized at once that the Commission would involve him in enormous expenses, and that both his fortune and good name were at stake. Mr. Gladstone was one of the first to point



this out to Englishmen. In a speech at Burslem, in August last, he said:

"The charges against Mr. Parnell would, if proved, destroy everything he valued—political power and position. But he is going to be tried on vague general charges. I will never believe Mr. Parnell guilty of personal dishonor. The inquiry by the Commission may last for years, which would mean pecuniary ruin for Mr. Parnell, while the expense to the *Times* would be a mere flea bite. Regarding the action brought in Edinburgh by Mr. Parnell against the *Times*, Mr. Parnell will be certain to get justice. If the letters were forged, he may get substantial damages; but a special clause in the Commission Bill indemnifies the *Times* if the charges are not made good. That is a specimen of the Government's sense of equality."

The Parnell Defence Fund was simultaneously opened in England, Ireland, the United States, Canada, and the Australias.

An address, issued in this country in August, 1888, by Mr. John Fitzgerald, President of the Irish National League of America, called forth an excited opposition from the united Tory press of England. This address, in terse language, stated the whole case, dwelling strongly on the suit in the Scottish courts. The following extract was the special cause of the Tory protest, though it was almost a repetition of the expressions of eminent English Liberals in Parliament:

"Mr. Parnell seeks from a Scottish jury the justice that could not be obtained from the British Parliament nor from London law courts liable to the interference of corrupt Government officials. Armed with unanswerable evidence, Mr. Parnell asks a jury of honest Scotchmen to convict the proprietors of the *Times* of uttering forged letters and of attempting by such criminal means to destroy the reputations of honest men. . . . .

"To prevent that result and its attendant consequences, the coffers of the London *Times* will be supplemented by the secret-service money at the disposal of the Government, and no means that can safely help to defeat the ends of justice will be left untried by this Cabinet, so experienced in all the darksome ways abhorrent to honest men. In such a critical position Mr. Parnell must not be left to fight unaided. The Irish race must not permit their leader to fail in his efforts to secure a fair hearing of his cause for mere want of funds to carry on what must be an expensive suit. It is our cause he is fighting. It is we who through him are assailed by this combination of perjurers and forgers, and it is incumbent upon us to stand loyally by him and give him that financial support which the circumstances may demand. A Parnell defense fund should be inaugurated in every State without delay."

The Parnell Commission, as it is universally called, opened its first session in London on September 17th, 1888. The court in which the sittings are held (the Probate Court) is a very limited room, and the crowding at first was excessive, over 200 reporters, representing English, Irish and American papers, being present.

Sir Charles Russell, Q.C., M.P., and Mr. Herbert H. Asquith, M.P. for the east division of Fife, were the first counsel for the Irish side. Before opening the regular proceedings Justice Hannen asked Sir Charles Russell for whom he appeared.

"I represent eighty-four Irish Members of Parliament," was the reply. Several other lawyers of distinction have since been added.

The counsel for the *Times* were the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster), Sir Henry James, Q.C., and Mr. W. Graham, with Mr. John Atkinson, Q.C., and Mr. Ronan, of the Irish bar.

The case opened with a demand by Mr. Parnell's counsel for the production of the originals of the letters published by the *Times*. The judges evaded this first appeal to their justice, saying that it was understood "that the *Times* would produce all the letters and documents affecting Mr. Parnell and the others against whom it brought charges;" but adding this saving clause for the *Times*: "But if the parties cannot agree as to the production of the papers, the judges will deal with the disputed points in chambers afterwards." Of course the *Times'* lawyers could not agree; but the counsel for Mr. Parnell stopped proceedings by insisting that this question be at once decided. The judges retired to deliberate, and returned with the decision that they should order the production of the letters demanded by the counsel for Mr. Parnell.

"The result so far," wrote a member of Parliament who was present, "is satisfactory to the Irish party. The judges seem to realize that they are standing in the glare of a fierce light, with the eyes of the whole world upon them. They are judging a case as important as the impeachment of Warren Hastings or the trial of Charles I. No matter what their personal predilections or politics may be, they see the necessity for caution and impartiality. That gives great strength to the Irish cause."

This sanguine observer has since had reason to change his opinion. From the opening day, with one or two exceptions, the judges have steadily ruled against the Irish side and in favor of the *Times*. One of these exceptions was, however, very important. Late in October the judges ordered the *Times* to produce certain forged letters supplied by their agent in America, Roberts, which even the *Times* had discovered to be forgeries.

Before the sessions were two weeks old public patience was exhausted, and the tactics of the *Times* and the commissioners were generally understood. The court was no longer crowded. The Attorney-General made an interminable opening speech of many days' delivery, in which he rehashed the old stories and charges of the O'Donnell trial, going out of his way at every sentence to extend the unsupported slanders and embrace new names in his charges. He outlined a scheme of taking Ireland, county by county, and presenting every breach of the peace and every alleged "outrage" for eight years past, without making any attempt to prove their connection with the National League, much less the responsibility of the Irish leaders. He concluded his monstrous

speech by stating that men who had actually participated in outrages would be called as witnesses, and they would tell what moneys had been paid to them, and how the crimes they were hired to commit had been arranged.

From the address of the Attorney-General it was at last learned that the *Times'* case against Mr. Parnell is that in 1879 he became an ally of Michael Davitt in founding the Land League, a conspiracy which aimed at uniting the farmers of Ireland in a strike against rent, and ultimately at the separation of Ireland from England; that in the promotion of the objects of the League Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt made use of the moonlighter, the dynamitard and the assassin. And in support of this contention the *Times* put in evidence letters of Mr. Parnell justifying the Phoenix Park murders; letters and articles which have appeared in America advocating the use of dynamite; and speeches made in Ireland and in America, which incited to the committal of outrages and murders, and brought them about.

It was hoped that the inquiry would at least become interesting when the witnesses came up for examination; but even this was a disappointment. The *Times* presented witness after witness of the same indescribable "informer" kind, varied by the testimony of Irish constabulary inspectors, and of persons who had suffered from any agrarian or other association or from personal vengeance.

The informers' evidence was easily riddled by cross-examination. They broke down almost without exception. Not a scintilla of evidence worth hearing has yet been produced to connect the Nationalist members with the alleged outrages, though this was the special province of the informers.

Of course there were many dramatic scenes and memorable moments. Late in November a zealous police inspector from Ireland was asked on cross-examination "how long he had been engaged in getting up a case for the *Times*?" The *Times'* counsel objected, whereupon Sir Charles Russell exclaimed: "We charge and intend to prove that the whole executive authority in Ireland, even including the resident magistrates, is engaged in getting up the *Times'* case."

The witnesses for the *Times*, up to the day of adjournment in December, were, in the main, men whose testimony was as questionable as their characters. Never since Falstaff's ragged company has such a crew been gathered for imperial service. A few examples are worth giving:

Early in November, in a London tavern opposite the law courts, two men quarrelled, and one tried to murder the other by shooting him with a revolver. The would-be murderer was arrested, and was found to be a chief witness for the *Times*, a farrier from Tralee,



"a dirty, repulsive-looking fellow," says the English report, named Joseph Kavanagh. The other man was Patrick Lane, an intense Irishman, who keeps a shoemaker's shop in London, but who was playing the part of a perjurer, receiving money and instructions from the *Times'* counsel, and giving information of his discoveries to friends of the Irish members. Lane and Kavanagh had met, and Kavanagh had confided to Lane, whom he regarded as a fellow-informer, that he was going to swear that Irish leaders had paid him money to commit outrages; that the *Times'* solicitor gave him all the money he wanted, paid for his board and lodging, and paid him £6 a week for pocket money. (The accuracy of these stories has been fully verified by the Irish counsel.) At last Kavanagh discovered that Lane was not an informer to be trusted, a quarrel ensued, and the real informer and outrage-monger, armed, of course, drew his revolver and attempted to murder the man who knew him to be a hired perjurer.

This affair throws a lurid light on the quality of the *Times'* evidence. When Kavanagh was arrested he defied the authorities, and boasted that the *Times* would look after him. His boast came true, for next day, when he was arraigned, Solicitor Langham announced that he had been instructed by the *Times* to defend the prisoner. Lane, on oath, told the whole story, gloried in the practical joke he had played on the *Times*, because, as he said, their solicitor, Soames, was sending his agents out to suborn evidence designed to damn and blacken the character of honest men; "but," added Lane, doing his best to add an inch or two to his low stature, "he won't manufacture this Paddy into an informer."

The court laughed, and the laugh became a prolonged roar, when, in extenuation of the fact that he had bobbed his head very low when Kavanagh fired, he laid down this deliciously Hibernian aphorism: "It is better to be a coward five minutes than to be dead all your lifetime." The utmost ingenuity of the *Times'* solicitor failed to shake the evidence of Lane and his witnesses, and the prisoner Kavanagh was remanded. It is not likely that he will be punished for his crime; but the *Times* evidently has lost a valuable witness.

In the first week of December the *Times* produced a ready witness named Walsh, who swore that, while he was assistant secretary of the National League, he manufactured outrages at the request of the local leaders of the League. On cross-examination even the judges were surprised when Walsh confessed himself a burglar and a forger, and that he had only consented to give evidence for the *Times* when the police threatened prosecution for forgery.

An attempt was made to create a sensation over the testimony as to Lord Mountmorres' murder, his widow appearing in

court in deep mourning. An informer named Burke, however, told too much. He said that about fourteen years ago he took a secret oath in England. He returned to Ireland, and with some of his fellows planned the death of Lord Mountmorres. He told the names of the men who were guilty, and he ascribed their orders to the Land League. In reply to Sir Charles Russell he confessed himself utterly unable to explain anything with regard to the secret oath, to the establishment of the Land League, or to the manner of Mountmorres' death.

Another hoax in which the *Times* was the victim was the case of Patrick Molloy, of Dublin, who became their paid agent. One of the Invincibles of 1882 was named Molloy, and the *Times* was led to believe that a young man of that name in Dublin was the same person. They approached him, and they met their match; he led on the *Times* folk so that he got all sorts of promises, and when he finally declined to go to London the judges had him arrested and brought into court. There the whole hoax was disclosed, and, to add to the discomfiture of the *Times* and its partisans on the bench, Sir Charles Russell succeeded in preventing the *Times* from wriggling out of the matter.

When Molloy was called for the *Times* he had no evidence to give; but, on cross-examination by Michael Davitt, he stated that a solicitor's clerk in Dublin had promised him money if he would try to criminate Mr. Davitt either by true or false evidence.

Other witnesses were called, who swore that they knew of cases of boycotting and outrage. On being cross-examined they all testified that they knew of persons who had "written threatening letters to themselves," their object being to excite sympathy. The League, they said, denounced outrages, and was mainly instrumental in securing reductions in rent, which were very properly requested after the bad seasons of 1878 and 1879. These witnesses said it was their belief that if the reductions had been voluntarily granted the country would have remained peaceful.

The last two witnesses for the *Times*, examined on the eve and the day of adjourning the court till the 15th of January, turned out to be interesting specimens of the informer class, so that the Commission adjourned with an unfavorable outlook for the *Times*.

The first of these witnesses was a young man, evidently newly-clad, who gave his name as James Buckley, a laborer from Causeway, Tralee, formerly of the Kerry militia, transferred to the Middleboro regiment, from which he had been discharged, with a character which he swore was good, but which he had once destroyed. He testified to the *Times*' counsel that he had been sworn into the Fenian Brotherhood in 1880, and that all his brother Fenians belonged to the Land League. He told a queer story about a friend of his,

named Roche, who had been expelled from the League, and who had become a police spy. Buckley was one of two or three selected to kill Roche, whom he met soon after, at seven o'clock of a summer evening, a few hundred yards from the police barracks. He swore that he fired a revolver four times at Roche, but it missed fire. Three times he had fired while he held Roche by the coat. After this very palpable "outrage," Roche said to him in a friendly way: "Come over to the river till I put a bush in the gap." Roche afterward shouted "murder!" and went and gave information, and Buckley was arrested; but he had two men ready to swear an *alibi*; and, as he and Roche were at this time giving secret information to the police, the charge was not pressed and he was released, to become a close friend of Roche again. Though he was charged with attempted murder, he was released without trial or bail. On cross-examination this precious witness confessed that his character for veracity was bad, that he had been discharged from the militia with a character which he had destroyed, that he had been convicted at petty sessions in Ireland "four or five times," that he had broken open his mother's box and robbed her, and that his mother was now in the Listowel workhouse.

The last witness cross-examined before adjournment was an informer, named O'Connor, from Castleisland. This witness had told a strong and straight story for the *Times*, bearing hard on Mr. Timothy Harrington, M.P., who, he swore, had employed him and others in 1880 to go around by night and threaten voters to vote for the Nationalist candidate. On cross-examination, this witness confessed that he had been in the pay of the police since 1866, and that he had made a statement to a Government agent in Dublin, named Walker, "who pressed him rather hard, and asked him about Mr. Harrington." At this period of the cross-examination Sir Charles Russell handed the informer a letter, and asked him if he had written it. The color left the man's face as he looked at the letter, and in a low voice he admitted that it was his writing, addressed to his brother in Ireland. Sir Charles Russell then read the letter, as follows:

LONDON, 3d December, 1888.

DEAR PAT.: I am here in London since yesterday morning. I was in Dublin for two days. I got myself summoned for the *Times*. I thought I could make a few pounds in the transaction, but I find I cannot unless I would swear quare things. I am afraid they will send me to jail or at least give me nothing to carry me home. I would not bother with it at all, but my health was very bad when I was at home, and I thought I would take a short voyage and see a doctor at their expense (laughter), but instead of that doing me any good it has made me worse a little. I will be examined to-morrow, Tuesday, the 4th. Get some daily paper, the *Freeman*, and see how it will be on it. You need not mind replying to this, as I will leave this house as soon as I am examined, which won't be longer than to-morrow, Tuesday. Whatever way it will end do not blame me for it. I thought to do some good, but I fear I can-



not, but harm. Tell Martin to have thirty shillings out of the bank, as I fear I will have to send for the cost if he has got it. After the fair I may not need it, but I am afraid I may. I will write again to-morrow night, or at furthest on Wednesday, if I am alive and at liberty.

Your unfortunate brother,  
THOMAS O'CONNOR.

This was the last word of testimony heard by the Parnell Commission before its adjournment in December, and it is typical. It shows the straits in which are the Government and the *Times* to connect the Irish leaders with the commission of outrage. A case that relies on such means is necessarily a weak and failing case; and though the inquiry is not yet over, from the past we may prejudge the future. Were there stronger witnesses to come hereafter, the *Times* would not have risked its case by using creatures like these in the early stages of the trial.

It will be said that these are only the weaker links of the chain, and this is true. But they are the only links presented to connect the Nationalists with the commission of crime. The stronger links are cases of utterly disassociated outrage, of agrarian and White-boy and personal offences, against which the National leaders have always warned the people.

During all the time of the trial, the coercion rule in Ireland has been applied with redoubled rigor. Half-a-score members of Parliament are either in prison or about to be tried for nominal breaches of the Coercion Law. On Christmas Eve, Mr. James J. O'Kelly, M.P., was released, after three months' imprisonment, and a week later Mr. Timothy Harrington, M.P., editor of the *Kerry Sentinel*, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment, "with hard labor," which specially condemns him to the performance of degrading offices, in association with criminal prisoners. On January 4th, this year, Mr. Finucane, M.P., was sentenced to a month's imprisonment; he was escorted to Castleconnell jail by the mayor and crowds of cheering people. William O'Brien, M.P., editor of *United Ireland*, was ordered to appear before the Parnell Commission on the 15th of January to receive sentence, for writing of the *Times* as the "Forger." To this summons Mr. O'Brien has replied in his paper:

"For speaking the truth fearlessly we have no contrition, but if the Attorney-General can suggest a line in our leader in which we have diverted from the strictest accuracy, we will tender an ample apology. Perhaps his sensitive soul was stirred by our allusion to his client as the 'Forger.' He really must make allowance for Press exigencies. We have used the name since the 'alleged *facsimile* letters' first appeared, and we will cease to use it only when they are proved genuine. If anything is likely to act as a deterrent on the 'Forger's' witnesses it is not our humble articles, but the scorching cross-examination of SIR CHARLES RUSSELL. Why don't they attach him for contempt?"

On the opening of the Commission on January 15th, Mr. O'Brien appeared in his own defence, and received only a warning for the future.

On January 24th, Mr. Wm. O'Brien appeared for trial on a charge of conspiracy, at Carrick-on-Suir, County Tipperary. The Government had issued a proclamation forbidding a demonstration; but 20,000 persons assembled to welcome Mr. O'Brien with cheers. The constabulary were ordered to charge the crowd, which they did with bayonets and clubs, wounding a great many. Mr. O'Brien was struck with a police rifle-stock, and Mr. T. M. Healy, M. P., was threatened with a bayonet at his breast.

Mr. O'Brien is also under summons to appear for trial at Killarney on January 29th, on the charge of inducing tenants not to pay rents. Still another summons has been served on him, to appear for trial at Rathmore, on February 14th, on a similar charge. So that it will go hard with the three English judges and the stipendiary magistrates of Ireland, if they are not able to lock up for at least six months this outspoken and courageous editor and Member of Parliament.

Besides these charges and trials, other Irish members of Parliament have the cloud of the prison hanging over their heads. Mr. J. D. Sheahan, M. P., has been tried, but not sentenced, on account of ill health; and summonses and warrants have been issued for the following gentlemen since the first of January: Denis Kilbride, M. P.; James L. Carew, M. P.; John O'Conner, M. P.; Dr. Tanner, M. P.; and Mr. Condon, M. P. On the 23d of January, Mr. David Sheehy, M. P., who had made a speech for the Liberal candidate at Govan, where the Conservatives were signally defeated, was arrested under the Irish Coercion Act.

In every form of stricture, Coercion is at its highest point as the year 1889 opens. Evictions are proceeding with unexampled ferocity. The blind hope of the landlord party appears to be that, while they have the power in their hands, it is their best policy to sweep the people and their homes off the land, even if a desert is produced. It is the Cromwellian policy over again, with writs and crow-bar brigades instead of halters and slave-ships.

But banishment has turned out to be not a cure but a disease worse than the original. The wiser and more patriotic half of England acknowledges this, and is working to undo the evil. The cruel expatriation of the Irish people has filled the world with enemies, not only of aristocratic landlordism, but of the English power that supports the system. Ireland has won a lasting victory in proving to Liberal England that the Tories are not legislating for the empire, but for their own limited class and its privileges.

But even under the darkest cloud that Ireland has known since 1798, it is true and obvious that the unhappy nation stands in a more hopeful and advantageous position than it has ever occupied since the Norman invasion. For the first time in history there is a powerful English party with a national platform of Home Rule for Ireland. And this is no transient or personal movement, depending on one British leader. It is the formalized policy of the English Liberal party—a programme that is absolutely certain of fulfilment.

It is said by many, and hoped by the Tories, that the death of Mr. Gladstone or of Mr. Parnell would assuredly begin the decline of the Home Rule movement. The contrary is the safer prophecy. Though it is to be hoped that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell will live to carry out the noble measure they have begun, it is certain now that the death of one, or even of both, would only remove from the Home Rule movement an element of personality, and leave it stronger than before. A reform is never at its full strength so long as it depends on one or two men, but when it has become part of the moral or common sense of the people.

From this standpoint, the Parnell Commission, with its incredible vileness in the witness-box, and its open partizanship on the bench; the widespread evictions and burning of peasant homes in Ireland; the jails filled with the honored representatives of the people; the influences of the Church implored to help the mailed hand of coercion—all these are signs favorable. They remove the Irish question from the care of party leaders, and place the responsibility on English conscience and civilization.

The patent evils of perjury, eviction, misery and unrest are the eruption of the disease of misgovernment that must be speedily cured, not by local repression, but by constitutional remedies.

Mr. Parnell himself, speaking on December 27th, after the adjournment of the Commission, summed up the proceedings in these words: "As to the general charges brought against our organization and movement, that is a matter of speculation, and, to some extent, of history, and a law-court is no more competent to decide it than anybody else. Up to the present, the *Times* has not got beyond a general description of the disturbed state of Ireland. Every attempt to connect, not us personally—for there hasn't been even an attempt to do that, except in the ridiculous story about Harrington told by an informer—but every attempt to connect our organization with crime, has completely broken down. As to the forged letters, let me confine myself strictly to the statement that we shall prove our case to the hilt."

Nothing could better close this article than the words that closed the year 1888 for Ireland from Pope Leo XIII., added to those



of Mr. Parnell. Here are the words of the Pope, addressed to the Irish people through the Archbishop of Dublin :

“Whilst we embrace with a father’s love every member of the fold of Christ, which He has entrusted to our keeping, our most special care, the first place in our thoughts is reserved for those whom we know to be sufferers from misfortune. For we are moved by that instinct which nature has implanted in the heart of every parent to love and cherish, beyond all the rest, those of their children who have been stricken by any calamity. For this reason, we have always held in a special feeling of affection the Catholics of Ireland, long and sorely tried by so many afflictions. And we have ever cherished them with a love all the more intense, for their marvellous fortitude under those sufferings and for their hereditary attachment to their religion, which no pressure of misfortune has ever been able to destroy or weaken.

“As to the counsels that we have given them from time to time, and our recent decree, we were moved in these things not only by the consideration of what is conformable to truth and justice, but also by the desire of advancing your interests. For such is our affection for you that it does not suffer us to allow the cause in which Ireland is struggling to be weakened by the introduction of anything that could justly be brought in reproach against it.”

---

## THE YEAR 1888—A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT.

HABITUAL introspection at the close of each day is strongly recommended by the Catholic Church as one of the most effective means for self-improvement. For each sunrise and each sunset implies for the individual a nearer and nearer approach to that last day on which the transitory earthly habitation will be left behind, and therewith the time ended during which it lies within our power to prepare ourselves for timeless eternity. The wisdom of this injunction is too apparent to require any elucidation. And in a similar sense, we take it, the larger life of nations, and the life of mankind as a whole, stand also in need of having *their* days from time to time carefully examined. What a day means for the individual, that a year may be said to mean in the life of a nation, and a still longer period, a century, in the life of the world.

There is much in the year 1888 that may escape superficial examination and yet forms the *raison d'être* why history will attach to it greater importance, not so much, however, in the outer, but rather in the inner, life of the civilized world.

During the last twelve months no great battles were fought, no war cast its gloom over Europe, no invention like that of steam or

electricity is to be recorded. But the series of events which took place impresses us deeply when we look below their surface and try to understand their significance for the future. Unless the "yesterday" stands vividly before our eyes, how can we forecast the "to-morrow"? The Papal jubilee ushered in '88, an omen auspicious in itself. Death struck twice the ruler of Germany, while Austria and Greece celebrated the fortieth and twenty-fifth anniversaries of their respective rulers. In the United States the result of the election for President put again the Republican party into power. These events in themselves possess hardly enough intrinsic value to mark 1888 as a year memorable in the annals of history, since they register merely what might be called, not inappropriately, "family events," affecting the Catholics, affecting Germany, Austria, Greece and the United States, but not the civilized world at large. So, at least, the casual observer may hold; but how different he will judge when he analyses these seeming family events.

The Papal jubilee, as a feast, concerned, strictly speaking, only the Catholic world. For the fact that an old man who happens to sit in the chair of St. Peter celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, is not in itself of any historical importance. Many priests all the world over do every year the same, and it remains a personal, a local affair. It is, of course, easy to understand that if that priest happens to be the Pope, the Catholic world seizes the opportunity to offer its congratulations to the head of the Church and give expression to its sense of filial attachment and loyal devotion. But the jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. meant more, much more. He is not only Pope, but he is also the prisoner in the Vatican; and yet, to pay homage to that prisoner, Protestant rulers, and even those outside the pale of Christianity, the Sultan, and the Shah of Persia, and the Emperor of China, vied with each other by personal letter and by costly gifts. Those prophets, therefore, who had predicted that the fall of Rome signified the end of the Papal power, were rudely shaken in their belief. The Papal jubilee was undeniably the occasion to show to an incredulous world that the Papal authority survived the loss of temporal power, and was still a universally recognized fact. It was seen that, instead of having sunk into the grave when Rome became the capital of the Italian Kingdom, the Papacy under Leo XIII. exercised a wide influence, wielded a vast power. Few of his most illustrious predecessors in the chair of St. Peter were as much the objects of honor and distinction by sovereigns and rulers all over the world as Leo XIII. The present ruler of Christendom combines, it is true, qualities in his person such as few men are endowed with. Rare intellectual gifts, and uncommon depth of learning, an unusually comprehensive statesmanship, a wisdom

and moderation as great as his piety and firmness, all helped to secure that tribute of recognition which the world never refuses to greatness. Yet it would be erroneous to believe that it was the person alone to whom the world hastened to express its deep sense of admiration; it was much more the office, the ruler of Christianity, the head of the Catholic world, that was honored. And therein, it seems to us, lies hidden a tacit acknowledgment that deserves to be weighed carefully.

Nor is this all. The Papal jubilee taught men still more. It demonstrated by irresistible facts the marvellous, though silent and unostentatious, growth of the Church and faithful allegiance and loyal devotion of the millions of children who look upon the Pope as their spiritual father; it showed the deathless Church marching onward and forward to victory on its mission of saving mankind. For months and months countless numbers of pilgrims went to the Eternal City to show that in every climate, in every nation, in every country there were subjects whose fervent adherence to the Bishop of Rome could not be doubted. The Vatican Exhibition undeceived men and furnished an evidence, more precious than the gifts it contained, that Christianity has an indwelling, indestructible power of expansion. If the past had not offered sufficient testimony that neither tyranny nor persecution, neither heresy nor schism, could shake the edifice built upon a rock, the present witnessed at all events that the Pope, even in prison, rules Catholicity, and without having lost influence, which the infallible head of an infallible creed must needs wield. The tie that binds head and members of the body Catholic together does not consist in the undisputed ownership of Rome; Italy perceived that the city on the Tiber is the Eternal City only because of the relationship of the Pope to it, deprived though he is of exercising his lawful rights over the same. The enemies of Christianity learnt that the Pope's voice is still the voice of authority, notwithstanding his confinement, and the obligation to obey it is not destroyed by his imprisonment. The anomalous position of the *one* sovereign who has subjects in every part of the world, and of every tongue and color, was in a singular manner illustrated also during 1888. The one great fact, then, which the past year forces upon our attention, lies in the general public recognition of the Catholic Church as the one religion possessing a vitality, a strength, a vigor which neither time abates nor adverse circumstances change.

The young German empire buried within three months no less than two emperors. The one, William I., who had led the united German forces from victory to victory and thereby cemented the nation into one great whole, who had been the instrument chosen by Providence to erect the new empire, who was allowed to out-



live the threescore and ten allotted to man, and who was at once a model of kingly dignity and modesty, was called away in February, and the whole nation in deep mourning followed his bier. Nor stood that grief long alone, for his son and successor, Frederic I., who was then already the sure victim of an incurable affliction and had undergone a terrible operation, so that death with him was but a question of time. Ninety-nine days after his father's death the son died, and so the two who had taken the most active part in fashioning the empire of Germany were both laid in the grave before spring's noontide. If the long life and venerable form and eventful career had endeared William I. to ail German hearts, the manly fortitude and heroic suffering of Frederic I. touched their chords of sympathy and engraved the memory of his short reign in no less vivid characters upon the annals of German history. Grave were the misgivings entertained by the cabinets of Europe for the peace of Europe at the demise of William I., graver still when Frederic I.'s death was announced and the grandson who had buried two progenitors within so short a time assumed the reins of government as William II. Russia's attitude in the southeast of Europe, and the movement of military forces towards the Prussian and Austrian frontiers, was a menace to the peace of Europe. France, still unable to forget *l'année terrible*, conjured up another dark cloud on the political horizon. For, Boulanger's success might bring on a war, and if so no one could foresee what dimensions it would assume. The youthful emperor of Germany was, moreover, presumed to be full of a warlike spirit, and so uneasy apprehensions prevailed lest the drum should beat the alarum that would summon some twelve millions of men under arms and precipitate the Continent into a struggle which would raise hecatombs of men and leave countless widows and orphans to mourn for the bread-winners that fell on the battlefields. But that dread also, happily, passed away. Mindful of the bequest of grandfather and father, the young emperor dispelled the fears connected with his accession to the throne by a series of visits to St. Petersburg, Vienna and Rome which, while they threw out in bold relief the position accorded to Germany by all European powers, offered at the same time a guarantee that the triple alliance formed by Germany, Austria and Italy was no empty sound, and that whosoever ventured to disturb the internal development of the nations would be confronted by the combined forces, an encounter promising to be fraught with dire consequences for the disturber, in view of the numerical strength and discipline of the armies of the allied powers. The bonds of union between Prussia proper and the German rulers, as also with the northern kingdoms, Sweden and Norway and

Denmark, were solidified by William II. after his return from the visit to the Czar.

The one visit, however, which best bespeaks the attitude of the Protestant Emperor was his visit to the Pope. As guest of the King of Italy in the latter's capital, he could not drive in Italian court carriages to the Vatican to pay his respects to the Pope; for that might have been construed, with a good deal of semblance of truth, into an official recognition of the present status of the Papacy. Therefore a course was pursued that cannot be distorted into any such construction. All embassies are, as is well known, territories of the respective states whose ambassadors reside therein, and the German embassy at Rome is, of course, no exception in this respect. So the German Emperor drove from his own territory, viz., the German embassy, and not in carriages belonging to the king of Italy, but in his own court carriage, drawn by his own horses, all of which had for that express purpose been transported from Berlin to Rome, to the Vatican, and back from there again to the German embassy. The Liberal press tried hard to misrepresent this affair and give it a very different coloring, but the facts themselves do not warrant any other interpretation than this, that the German emperor, with a consideration equalled only by his tact, studiously and successfully avoided giving by his action any official approval, as it were, of the existing state of affairs regarding the Papacy. Add to this that, in order to silence the various rumors which some journals spread, the official organ of the Chancellor of the German empire wrote: "In Prussia the position of the Pope as the head of the Church, to which a good third of Prussian subjects belong, is officially recognized, and the Pope as the head of the Bishops forms part of our institutions." Thus it is patent that the enemies of the Church tried in vain to transmute the visit of William II. to Leo XIII. into an approval of the loss of temporal power. The youthful German emperor has no doubt disappointed the sanguine hopes of the enemies of Rome, as he likewise disappointed the enemies of peace.

Turning now to Austro-Hungary, the jubilee celebrated there derives much of its significance from a brief reflection upon the past. Austria has borne for 600 years the dignity and the heavy responsibility of the "Christian" empire and the obligation resulting therefrom to stand by the Church of Rome. Her rulers were the born protectors of Christianity and of the Christian social and political institutions. She is the *one* State in which the dignity of legitimacy, the "Kingdom by the grace of God," has been preserved, that is to say, the social kingdom as given by natural and revealed right; she is the one State which has not spent itself in the service of a socially and economically and religiously diseased

Liberalism; she it was that protected Catholicity against Protestantism in the Thirty Years' War; she stood up for Christianity against Islamism; she stood foremost and longest against the French conqueror. Napoleon's first defeat, at Aspern, Austria, unaided, administered, and at Leipzig, in the final struggle, her General commanded the allied forces. The monarchy, by the union of different nationalities under one head, was a political symbol of Christ's Church. The historic mission of Austria is its right of existence, and that mission consists now in reviving Christian principles in the life of the State, in cementing by unity of faith and Christian charity the nations together which nationalism misled and separated, in ousting Liberalism and replacing it by Christian socialism. Burdened at once with the cross and the imperial crown of thorns, Austria has followed the way of the cross through history. There has not been wanting in its life the Judas Iscariot of Liberalism and of Pessimism; but there has also never been wanting those who guided on the State with unchangeable loyalty and faith in its providential mission, and it was the present Emperor's fate to lead the people under his septre through many vicissitudes in a course which promises a social reconstruction on entirely Christian principles. The spirit of the age did not pass by Austria, but while it was able to taint, it was unable to corrupt the realm. In 1848, when the principles of 1789 moved like a hailstorm over middle Europe, Austria too had its revolution, and it was then that Francis Joseph, at the age of eighteen, had to ascend the throne and embark upon the difficult task of bringing order out of chaos. The Liberal ideas converted the Empire into a Constitutional Monarchy, but for the last eleven years the Government is again in the trustworthy hands of a Catholic Cabinet which proceeds on the right line. The form which the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of his reign assumed at the express wish of the emperor, illustrates best the principles that animate this benevolent ruler. Whatever the provinces, cities, towns, villages or private persons intended to do to commemorate the event should be devoted to charity and to the alleviation of suffering; that was his express wish. So the poor and the helpless, the orphan and the widow, the aged and the infirm, are the recipients of the gifts which royalty and personal attachment and veneration prompted all to lay at the emperor's feet. Hardly a day of the year 1888 passed without a notice in the press that here a blind asylum had its corner-stone laid, there a hospital, here a fund for the support of aged laborers been donated, there a house for the education of poor children established. His private charities, unknown to the public, reach far beyond the sum of which anything is known. Thus Austria has, indeed, very good reason to



pray to the Ruler above for a long life to its ruler, "by the grace of God," below.

The small kingdom of Greece, after having passed through many ordeals, recovers gradually from them under George I., whose twenty-fifth anniversary occurred in November, and offered a welcome occasion to the people and to all friendly powers to felicitate the king on his successful reign. The betrothal of his son, the heir to the throne, to the sister of the German emperor, augurs well for the future of that country. Of the other European states, little of moment, from a historical standpoint, is to be mentioned.

In Russia the Czar and his family had a narrow, almost miraculous, escape from a terrible railway accident, which may have contributed to bringing about a decidedly more pacific policy. The triple alliance rendered, of course, an indefinite postponement of any scheme of aggrandizement very desirable for the present. The decline of Pan-Slavism in Servia forebodes an era of peaceful development in that little kingdom, as well as in the neighboring Bulgaria, whose ruler, Prince Ferdinand of Coburg, though not officially recognized by the signatory powers of the treaty of Berlin, strives to develop the resources of the country and to improve its internal condition. The unhappy republic of France appears to drift along without knowing whither. The danger of a dictatorship under the would-be hero-general Boulanger was hardly averted by the ridicule which the issue of his duel with Floquet threw upon him, before he achieved fresh electoral triumphs, and again a revision of the constitution loomed up. What it may lead to nobody can foretell who knows the French character.

An event of far-reaching importance is, however, the result of the Presidential election in the United States. For the return into power of the Republican party at the expiration of President Cleveland's term of office means a radical change in the policy of the Government. Inasmuch as it is the mission of the United States to prove that Liberalism and Christianity do not exclude each other, it remains to be seen how far the admitted tendency of the Republican party will devote itself to a reform of the social order which, in the United States as well as in Europe, is much needed, and attracts already the undivided attention of the statesmen in the several European commonwealths.

This brief summary of the strictly speaking historical events of 1888 hardly furnishes material for singling it out as a memorable one in the history of the world. Deaths of rulers and anniversaries of rulers concern, as has been said, the respective nations rather than the world, and so likewise the change of party in the

great American republic. If we insist, nevertheless, that 1888 signalizes the beginning of a new epoch, the reason for it must lie of necessity outside the array of facts that stand forth as historical landmarks. And this, we contend, is precisely the case.

Whether it be due to the warning words uttered by Leo XIII. at the very beginning of his Pontificate, that a social crisis is near at hand and can be solved only by reintegrating the principles of Christianity into the life of the nations, or whether it be due to the overwhelming evidence of the necessity of doing something for a proletariat that increases at an alarming rate, matters little. The fact remains that a consciousness of a social disturbance has obtained general currency, and that it is felt that thorough-going reforms are needed for averting a serious calamity. For proof of this we have to turn simply to legislative measures, partly enacted, partly proposed, in nearly every Parliament, in order to perceive that a decided veering round from Liberal to the only sound Christian principles is noticeable. If not an open and outspoken return to Christian social principles, it is at any rate a tacit recognition of the social value of Christianity. Consequently, it seems to us that this year will some day be marked "Return to Christian Socialism," and therefore deserves to be looked upon as one of vital importance in the history of culture and progress.

The modern economic system, un-Christian in its essence, and more so still in its application, has wrought havoc in all countries, whether Catholic or not. No government escaped the scourge of Liberalism, and of what Liberalism necessarily entails, "capitalism." The social elements which Christian ethics has properly balanced were unhinged by the delusive promise that the larger share of liberty opened to all an equal chance to attain whatever happiness man can attain in this world. Religion, as a purely individual matter, was eliminated from the social order. After a lapse of forty years, since in 1848 the Liberal ideas obtained vogue with more or less intensity everywhere, the results of the Liberal economic and social system are before us, and in a transparent clearness which admits of no denial.

The common laborer, of course, felt first the effects, and hence the labor question disturbed first of all the social order. It was found that the absolute freedom given him by Liberalism converted him into the absolute slave of the employer. But the labor question did not remain long alone. The agrarian question is now felt in the United States and in Europe alike. The farmer is unable to make both ends meet; the sale of his crops barely pays for the labor, and leaves him no profit. The burden of taxation grows heavier and heavier, and the peasantry groan under a load which has become unbearable. A fatal credit system, a no

less fatal right to divide and subdivide holdings, a reckless devastation of forests, and the like changes, impoverished gradually but surely the mainstay of all agricultural countries. At their expense the number and the wealth of the capitalists increased. The man who finds tilling the soil a road to the poorhouse abandons the plow and looks for employment in the city, and the steadily growing number of unemployed depresses in turn the price of labor, as is always the case when the supply exceeds the demand. Then there are the small trades-people. The master of the workshop, utterly unable to compete with the cheaper machine-made products of corporations, must, after a desperate struggle, close it, part with his independence and himself seek employment in the very factory that broke him up. He necessarily swells the number of the discontented. And even the small capitalist fares not much better. Against the big syndicate and money-institutions he has no power, and the process of absorption reduces him also in course of time to a salaried employee, a laborer after all. The big fish eat the little fish in the brook, in the lake, in the ocean; and so they do in social life. Productive labor has thus become everywhere the slave of capital's tyranny. That is the true statement of how society stands to-day. As the iron Chancellor strongly put it: "I will not see the aged laborer perish on the dunghill." It had come to that almost, and hence it was high time for inaugurating reforms.

The fact that nearly all civilized countries have enacted laws limiting the hours of labor, restricting the employment of children in factories, protecting women during the time of pregnancy, and that, moreover, the lines along which these measures move are not diverging, but converging, serves as a welcome sign that more correct ideas begin to supersede the notions of Liberalism on these points. The republic of Switzerland has, indeed, taken, the initiative to bring about, if possible, an international labor legislation. For, only uniform laws promise wholesome and lasting relief in times when a few hours' ride or a passage across the Atlantic can transfer the laborer from one country to another.

What underlies the labor question, underlies likewise all other problems. The highest law that should regulate the relations of man to man in the social order, is that of "justice," just as "charity" is the highest law in the moral order. That law of justice, as established by Christianity, has, to the detriment of mankind, been utterly wiped out by Liberalism. Applied to labor, it proclaims the principle that should equal the compensation paid for labor equal its value. This principle underlies the Christian idea of justice, and it certainly is plain and simple enough. But what business could continue to exist were it all at once introduced in



our day! So with the agrarian question, the small trades question, etc.; they all succumbed to the elimination of the law of Christian justice, which elimination has divided men practically into two classes, the oppressors and the oppressed.

The plutocracy, whose formation has been going on in every state during the last few decades, owes its origin and existence only to the extirpation of the Christian idea of justice from society, and has brought on that unnatural struggle after wealth as the "*summum bonum*," but which in the end proves destructive of the very basis of society. For, is it reasonable to be expected that the oppressors, growing fewer in proportion to the wealth amassed, can keep the oppressed, that large mass of discontented which intuitively have a sense of suffering from a social condition that is wrong, in a state of abject and inactive submission. The alternative consists either in a frantic outbreak which will override all laws and all institutions and wreck our civilization, or else in timely reforms on the one basis upon which Christian society has been erected.

Poor always did exist; they always will continue to exist as long as human beings people the globe. But "paupers" are a creation of Liberalism. We hear much about the energetic efforts on the part of Liberals to stave the tide of pauperism, but a few morsels of bread thrown to a hungry crowd do not appease its hunger. The modern Liberal searches diligently enough for the almost invisible bacillus, but fails to see that big worm "capitalism" that gnaws on the intestines of every nation. The anarchists and the bomb-throwers and the dynamiters talk one and the same language. The land doctrine of Henry George and the theories of Karl Marx have secured fanatical followers only because men driven nearly to despair cling to any promise of relief without weighing either soundness of doctrine or possibility of relief. Nor is it at all surprising to find an ignorant multitude unable to discriminate between what is right and just and what is wrong and unjust, when we reflect how the judgment of well-educated persons has been warped by the Liberal press. Newspapers are to-day a tremendous social power, and unfortunately the press, which is controlled, if not owned, by the capitalists, is permeated by the materialistic tendency of Liberalism, and hence is an instrument that has caused many erroneous opinions to be formed on living issues.

All the more, therefore, must we welcome the attention the intelligent public begins to pay to those men of heart and brain who devote their best energies to a social reform on the basis of true Christianity, a Baron Wambold, a Prince Lichtenstein, a Baron Vogelsang, the Dominican Father Albert Weiss, and others. They have done more to enlighten the world and bring about a proper understanding of the social crisis than those are willing to

concede who are beginning to incorporate their teachings in legislative measures. This nucleus of Catholics coming, as it does, more and more to the front, sheds a ray of bright hope over the darkened sky of society. The labors of these Christian social-politicians begin to bear fruit in the general awakening of the public to a realization that Christianity is as necessary to society as it is to the individual. Religion, it is seen at last, is more than a matter of the individual's conscience, and in proportion as this is understood, in the same proportion does religion as a social force, in fact the most powerful and influential social force.

And just here we encounter the solution of the apparent enigma, namely, a Liberal civilization, anti-Christian by necessity rather than by choice, paying an open and willing tribute to the enlightened occupant of St. Peter's chair. Men may be loth to acknowledge it, but they recognize by their actions that from that chair are spoken the only words of wisdom on the social situation. The refutation and condemnation of the erroneous doctrines of the day has neither been attempted nor carried out in any other quarter. Rome, and Rome alone, has pointed out that the fundamental laws of social existence have not been changed by steam and electricity and their application to the service of man; that we are still human beings with but a transitory home upon earth in order to prepare ourselves as creatures endowed with reason and free-will for our permanent home; and that hence no invention, no discovery, no philosophy can shake these primordial truths, nor what springs from them, so that the erection of a social order on any other basis contains within its own walls the guarantee of instability, and of sooner or later crumbling to pieces.

The sound sense of humanity revolts necessarily against the social monstrosity which Liberalism has built up, and the intense yearning of mankind to reach its destiny cannot be rooted out from the heart. The requirements of men as social beings are met by the Christian social order, and no other; co-existence and material pursuits are possible and conducive to earthly welfare only, if all differences are adjusted according to justice and equity and charity as declared and given by Christianity, and not according to human notions as to what these are.

The laying of a corner-stone of a Catholic university in the national capital of the United States possesses, in this connection, a deep meaning. It bespeaks the silent but progressive work of the Church; it announces her determination to prepare men fit to cope with the emergencies of the times; it tells us that the priest of the future will be equipped not only with the knowledge requisite for a proper discharge of those duties which the spiritual welfare of the souls entrusted to his care imposes upon him, but

also for those larger and wider duties which Christian socialism imposes upon him and adds on to his other functions. It is, in other words, a challenge and a prophecy: a challenge to imitate her who raises within cloister and seminary men devoted only to serve God through fellow-man, and equips them with the only weapon which defies destruction—truth. It is a prophecy in that the apostles of Christian socialism which the to-morrow will need, shall not be wanting. The reign of the almighty dollar may come to an end, the reign of justice never. How far will capitalism be ready to accord to the Catholic Church a voice in shaping the indispensable legislation on social matters? That, we take it, is the question of the future in the United States.

Some States in Europe have made their choice; they have chosen to prevent a social revolution that unquestionably would wreck the achievements of our civilization, by engrafting upon the present institutions the old ideas of the moral law, natural and revealed, as furnished by Christianity, and to establish thereby a historic continuity with the past. This is the manifesto of 1888 to the world; this the *raison d'être* of its being the dawn of a new day in the history of humanity's progress; this the meaning of the providential ordination that the jubilee of Rome's Vicar and the deaths of two great rulers should proclaim the perpetuity of Christ's Church on one hand, and the transitoriness of human greatness on the other; the firmness of the power of God, the weakness of even the greatest of men. 1888 bids us recognize that wherever "*convertere te ad dominum*" is understood by society, the bountiful blessings of divine mercy have not long to be waited for, and this return to social Christianity on the part of the State offers the guarantee that better days will await the generations who take the lessons of 1888 to heart and live up to what they enjoin.

What has been actually done towards a reorganization of society on Christian principles, consists in rudimentary beginnings only, whose main value lies principally in the recognition of the theory; but the better comprehension and the ardent zeal for a social reform is in the spirit of true Christianity that has risen to the surface and presages the deliverance of the people from the tyranny of Liberalism, capitalism and mammonism. The first centenary of the Revolution of 1889 will therefore witness the entombing of those ideas which then saw daylight, and the resurrection of those which, because divine, save society as they save men.



## THE CANADIAN SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

THE right which is enjoyed by Catholics, and by Protestants also, in parts of the Dominion of Canada respecting the appropriation of their own taxes to the support of their own schools, is a very important one and worthy of being well understood. It is a concession, a privilege, the dominant party may say; but the Catholics acknowledge it simply as a right, as a legislative sanction to the underlying principles of true education. They contend that the control of education cannot be rightfully divorced from the conscience of the parent; that the State with no conscience and with no conception of religion cannot undertake to impart religious instruction. A State School System, like an Established Church, has certain fascinations for the man in office as well as for the expectant politician; it affords him patronage, it offers him a chance to make a name for himself, and most of all it gives him a wonderful grip on the future generation. If to be the founder of a splendid State Church is likely now to be a dream of the past, there remains that appurtenance of it, a State School, which is hard to be relinquished. If we all cannot be expected to go to the National or State Church, we must be very narrow if we object to go to the National School. And so the energies of those who govern us, being diverted from the higher course, or what they deem the higher course, are the more strongly exerted towards that which remains. The State takes up education as the last stronghold of Cæsarism, and takes it up, at least in Canada, with a vengeance. Every one must be well educated in the arts and sciences; he must be enabled to enter the universities; he must learn an astonishing number of things whether or not they will ever be of the slightest use to him. The mind must be formed, the intellect must be trained. And so we have public schools, and high schools, and colleges, and universities, all, except a few struggling colleges, supported by the State, and presided over by a State official. The intellectual part of the youth being provided for, the moral training does not seem to be very important. It consists chiefly of inserting a few well-rounded platitudes—Pagan or Christian—wherever they could be conveniently worked in with the literary selections in the school books. But religious training is necessarily ignored. Some of the denominations, following the example of the Catholics, are striving to educate their own children in their own way; but their efforts are discountenanced and

they work under great disadvantages. The Juggernaut of the State rides over them. The State has money, and the appeal for general and higher educational facilities is one that is popular and patriotic. It is a drawing us out of the dark ages, it is enlightenment, it is the progress of the age. But there is no appeal for a higher or indeed any sort of religious training. The State itself, having no religion and naturally but a very heterogeneous conception of it, cannot be expected to teach religion any more than a joint-stock company could teach it. Its whole undisputed theology may be comprised in less than a page; and so it would not be worth while attempting to formulate any doctrine. A few, and these not "glittering generalities," must suffice. The Atheist and the Unitarian, the High-Churchman and the Methodist, the Ingersollite and the Catholic, may sit down at the common council of the nation and come to a conclusion as to the public works department or as to revenue, but they cannot make much headway with religious education, or even with highly diluted moral instruction in the schools. They wisely gave it up, protesting, however, that it is not essential; and even if it is, that it is sufficiently taught. At all events, whatever lack or deficiency there is in teaching the Divine science, there is a creditable overlap on the side of the human.

The writer is not concerned with the public or other State schools except in so far that they do not and cannot afford any guarantee to a parent of the religious instruction he may and ought to deem necessary for his child. The justness of this to all denominations was the origin of the Separate School System. That system is not, as is commonly supposed, even in Canada, an exclusive right or privilege for Catholics. It is extended to Protestants as well. There are separate schools for Protestants and for Catholics, making religious belief the line of separation; and separate schools for the colored people, making color the line of separation. The law is a little, but very little, in favor of the Catholic separate schools; as will be seen presently, the law inclines towards making public schools the vanishing point of Protestant separate schools. There are very few of these latter schools, for obvious reasons. It is rare that one form of Protestantism is so objectionable to another form as to superinduce an estrangement in the school-room; it is rather the fashion now in some parts of Canada for the different denominations to exchange pulpits on a Sunday. The week-day points of difference may be set down as a very slight divergence. This united front, or almost united front, of Protestantism, sufficed for the legislatures in times gone by to assume that there were only two religions so far as matters educational went; and they probably foresaw that it was a very poor specimen of a Prot-

estant that would not fall in one line where the Catholics were all on the opposite side.

And so, though it is convenient at times to rank Catholics with Methodists and Baptists and Anglicans and Presbyterians, as for instance, representatives in public offices and so on, yet in this matter of schools the population is to be regarded as Protestant and Catholic, and the legislation follows that supposition. Leaving out the colored schools as affording no special feature for our purpose, there are three sorts of elementary schools: The public school of no religion, the Catholic separate schools, and the Protestant separate schools for their churches respectively. The first of these is non-denominational, the other two are denominational by statute law.

The law as it now stands, for instance in the rather Protestant province of Ontario, is the result of a good many hard-fought battles in which it was difficult to avoid religious strife. It would be impossible to do more than sketch the history of it here, and even were it otherwise it is not a pleasant task. The reader will remember that when the French province of Quebec in the last half of the last century changed masters, a very small but important stream of immigration set in from Great Britain and Ireland. These were all Protestants, and belonged, of course, in those days, to the Established Church. They avoided the eastern province and generally came and settled in Western Canada, then a part of Quebec province. In 1791 the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain divided the old province of Quebec into Upper, or Western, and Lower, or Eastern Canada. This was opposed by the British emigrants, as it left some of them powerless among the French, and the remainder of them "hived" in Canada West. The provinces remained separated for fifty years, with a history enlivened by a couple of rebellions and an immense amount of petty tyranny. The British Act of 1791 (the Canada Bill) set apart one-seventh of all the public land for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy. This was the famous "Clergy Reserves," and was intended, no doubt, to be appropriated as endowments for rectories of the Church of England. These "Reserves" comprised about two millions of acres of the public domain of Upper Canada. In 1819 it was proposed to erect an Anglican rectory in every township; further instructions came about seven years later to the effect that these were to be endowed as soon as erected. The royal instructions on both of these occasions were disregarded, and things had come to such a pass in Church of England affairs that neither tithes could be collected nor rectories endowed in Canada at that time. All the other denominations were arrayed against the imperfectly established Church, but the Church of Scotland outstripped all



other opponents and proved in a legal way that she was as much a national Church as ever the Church of England had been. By a decision of the English Crown officers, the "Reserves" were declared to be equally the property of these two denominations. In the Act of Union between England and Scotland "the true Protestant religion" of the North Britons, though differing materially from the equally true Protestant religion of their southern neighbors, was "effectually and unalterably secured within the Kingdom of Scotland." So the Church of Scotland, being recognized at home, could not be set aside abroad where a slice of temporal lands was being distributed among "Protestant clergy." In every respect with the Church of England the Church of Rome was recognized before the law; but none of its adherents could fairly argue that its clergy should be regarded as Protestant. So they were shut out; and so also, in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, were all dissenting ministers.

In 1831 the Imperial Government was obliged to declare its abandonment of the "Reserves," and in 1839 an Act was passed to distribute the proceeds of these lands among certain religious denominations. This Act was never put into operation. It was not till the year 1854 that the question was finally disposed of. A distribution among the different municipalities was then authorized. It can be well imagined that discussions might arise according as the municipalities proceeded to dispose of the money.<sup>1</sup> They could apply it only as they had authority to apply other moneys; and at a distance now of some thirty years it would be hard to say that any disposition could be free from objection.

The feeling engendered by these Reserves and their final destination might easily have produced denominational schools. The Canadas were in a sort of religious ferment for half a century. There were at least two hostile camps. As things subsided the Church of England lost her prestige and was obliged to sit down with the Dissenters, and with such National Churchmen as are to be found in the Kirks. Finally the natural and proper division came, and as the Catholics stood up on one side, the Church of England and the others all joined hands on the other. The question of separate schools was, however, agitated long before the "Reserves" difficulty had settled itself. In the year 1840 the Eastern and Western Provinces of Canada were united under one government. In population they were nearly even in point of numbers; one was British and Protestant, the other was Catholic and French. Responsible government, such as at present prevails in England, had

---

<sup>1</sup> See the controversy between the Chief Superintendent of Education and the Very Rev. (afterwards Mgr.) Bruyere on the appropriation of the Clergy Reserve Funds.

just been secured, and the people were in a fair way towards governing themselves. One of the first Acts of the year 1841 was a School Law by which in rural districts separate schools, for either Protestants or Catholics, could be established; in cities and towns a joint board of trustees was supposed to be able to manage educational affairs. During the succeeding ten years a number of legislative experiments were made; in 1843 the Act was repealed as to Western Canada, and four years later an unsatisfactory Act was passed which in its turn was superseded by an Act of the year 1849. This latter one was never put in force. A complete School Law was enacted in 1851, but it was not for two years afterwards that the basis of the present law was constructed, nor till the year 1855 that anything satisfactory was reached. In the general election of 1857 the propriety of having separate schools was one of the chief issues at the polls, and the result was that the Catholic party from Canada East was in a position to rule the House.<sup>1</sup>

The Catholic Separate Schools in Western Canada numbered sixteen in the year 1851, increasing during the preceding decade from a solitary school in 1841 to the number mentioned. In the succeeding decade, or rather in 1862, there were 109 schools, with an attendance of 13,631 pupils. In 1863 the law was settled, such as with very slight modifications it exists at the present day. Under the Act of this latter year it was provided:

"Any number of persons, not less than five, being heads of families, and freeholders or householders, resident without any school section of any township, incorporated village, or town, or within any ward of any city or town, and being Roman Catholics, may convene a public meeting of persons desiring to establish a separate school for Roman Catholics, in such school section or ward, for the election of trustees for the management of the same."

The trustees so elected formed a body corporate, and had power to enforce and collect rates and contributions towards the support of the school, and they had and have all other necessary powers in that regard.

The Protestant and colored separate schools are now brought into existence in this way:

"Upon the application in writing of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town, or incorporated village, being Protestants, the Municipal Council of the said township, or the Board of School Trustees of any such city, town, or incorporated village, shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more separate schools for Protestants; . . . . and in every such case, such council or board, as the case may be, shall prescribe the limits of the section or sections of such schools."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee was returned at this election.

<sup>2</sup> Originally, in regard to these schools, it was necessary that there should be twelve applicants, but the law has very recently been changed. There are only half a dozen of Protestant separate schools in Ontario to-day.

The chief point of difference in the Protestant and Catholic schools is that in regard to the former there is this clause :

"No Protestant separate school shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the public school in such section is a Roman Catholic."

There is no corresponding clause to this in the Act as regards the Catholic schools. The supporters of the schools have to reside within a radius of three miles from the site of the school-house, otherwise, if not so situated, they can attend the public schools. So long as the separate schools exist they must be supported by those desiring to support them, but a Catholic can withdraw his support and allow his taxes to fall into the public schools.

The protection which the Separate School Act affords is of two kinds : it exempts from the public school tax and it secures a share of the public school fund. This is provided for by two sections :

"Every person paying rates, whether as proprietor or tenant, who, by himself or his agent, on or before the first day of March in any year, gives to the clerk of the municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic, and supporter of a separate school situated in the said municipality, or in a municipality contiguous thereto, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools, and of public school libraries, or for the purchase of land or erection of buildings for public school purposes, within the city, town, incorporated village, or section, in which he resides, for the then current year, and every subsequent year thereafter, while he continues a supporter of a separate school ; and such notice shall not be required to be renewed annually."

The share of the public monies devoted to education is reached in this way :

"Every separate school shall be entitled to a share in the fund annually granted by the Legislature of this Province for the support of public schools, and shall be entitled also to a share in all other public grants, investments and allotments for public school purposes now made or hereafter to be made by the Province or the municipal authorities, according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new separate school, as compared with the whole average number of pupils attending school in the same city, town, village, or township."—26 V., c. 5, s. 20.

Taking the Province of Ontario as a fair example of the working of a denominational elementary school system, a few statistics may be of some value. In round numbers the entire population is 2,000,000 ; the population between the ages of five and sixteen 500,000.<sup>1</sup> The grand total of schools of every description reaches

---

<sup>1</sup> The exact figures in the last census were 1,913,460 as the entire population, with 489,924 of school age. Of these 85,000 were the estimated number of Catholics.



about 5300, and of this number 200 are Roman Catholic separate schools. The entire Catholic population is between one-fifth and one-sixth of the whole, and the school children upwards of 90,000. It may seem extraordinary that there are not 800 or 900 schools for them, but the reason is obvious enough. In the report of separate schools in the year 1881 the Government Inspector, Mr. J. F. White, says:

"In school are laid, in great part, the first principles of the child's future conduct, and its will, heart, conscience, and whole character formed. There it is taught its duties, of which, as all Christians are agreed, the moral and religious are the most important. Catholics think, further, that religion, to be solid and effective, must be instilled throughout the child's entire education. Therefore, content with no mere secular instruction, and believing that education without religion is impossible, they asked for and obtained separate schools in which to give their children a religious training. In many instances they have not taken advantage of the privilege thus conferred. Frequently, where the Catholic ratepayers are greater than, or equal in number to, the other supporters, no effort has been made to separate. Again, in places where nearly all the population is Catholic, as in French, and some German, settlements, there exists no need for such schools. It thus happens that most of the Catholic children of the Province receive their training in public schools. That many of the latter are, in their character, as distinctively Catholic as separate schools is shown by the establishment, in some sections, of Protestant separate schools

"The trustees' returns of school population show that there are 484,224 children of school age. Of these, according to the ratio of population, at least 85,000 are Catholics. By the report for the present year, the number attending separate schools is 24,767. Allow for 2000 at colleges, private schools, etc., and for non-attendance at any school 2 per cent. of the total school population, the remainder, 56,533 (two-thirds), is in attendance at public schools. It must be remembered that about 30,000 of these attend school in Catholic settlements."

In the Educational Report for Ontario for the year 1888 the progress of the Catholic separate schools for the preceding ten years is given. The schools increased 57 in eleven years, and the number of teachers from 302 to 461. The Minister of Education, commenting on the general advancement, says: "It will be seen that the separate schools are steadily prospering, and that both as regards teachers and pupils they are becoming more efficient every year."

Speaking of the quality of education imparted, Mr. White says:

"The work of the separate schools is much the same in character as that done in public schools. Frequently it is assumed that the education given in the former is, of necessity, inferior to that imparted in other institutions. Facts, however, will not bear out this assumption. It is not to be supposed that a poor and sparsely attended school will bear comparison, as to its results, with a wealthy school having a large attendance. But, where the conditions have been at all equal for the two systems, separate schools show results in no way inferior to those of the public schools. The mark of inferiority cannot be attached to such schools as have, year after year, passed pupils for second and third class certificates, and whose work, in a few cases, compares favorably with that of some high schools."

The cost of pupils to the rate-payer is shown to be less, and generally a good deal less, to the separate than to the public school supporter. Here is the cost per pupil for the year referred to :

	Counties.	Cities.	Towns.
Public schools, . . . . .	\$5.70	\$9.30	\$6.20
Separate schools, . . . . .	4.70	4.78	5.66

It will be seen from this that, while in rural sections the cost per pupil is much the same, in the cities, where the religious orders do the work, the expenses are kept nearly one-half lower than in the public schools. Out of a total number of 451 teachers, 248 belonged to religious communities.

The Catholic children of the Province have an opportunity in all cases of going to their own schools, and if their fathers and guardians do not see fit to separate in particular localities, it is because they can do as well without a separation. It is obvious that, in a Catholic settlement with, say, half a dozen Protestant neighbors, it would be a disagreeable proceeding to erect a school which would deprive these half dozen of any sort of school, and would be controlled exactly the same as if there were no such thing as separate education. Accordingly in settlements where the Catholics can control the school, no matter what it may be called, they allow it to remain open to the minority by retaining it as a public school. Where in thinly settled districts it is a hard matter to maintain one school efficiently, it is often a subject of serious deliberation to both pastor and people whether a separation is or is not for their own good. In cities and towns good separate schools can almost always be counted on ; in villages and in rural districts the chances are the other way. If you have a thrifty, compact settlement, you can have a flourishing school anywhere ; it goes without saying that you must have substantial ratepayers within a reasonable radius before you can attempt a separate school.

In Ontario the Separate School system extends, practically, only to elementary schools. There are no Separate High Schools, no Separate Collegiate Institutes, no Separate Colleges, endowed by the people. There is a separation in the primary schools, but if a pupil wishes to get a higher school education, he must, generally, fall in with the National system. The High Schools receive very substantial support from the Government, and they can count on local support, public and private. The Provincial University is the culmination of these schools and colleges, but there are many other universities, though chiefly of a denominational character. The Education Department has no control over these, but it controls and supports the Provincial University, and the general school system, public and separate.

The supervision which the Educational Department has a right to direct over separate schools is of a very negative character. The Chief Superintendent, or the Minister, is compelled to acknowledge them, but he does very little besides. The regulations which can be prescribed are not of a very vital character; indeed, the Legislature itself is precluded from prejudicially affecting the school law. Separate schools existed for a good many years prior to the Confederation in 1867. In that year four of the British Provinces cast in their lot together as a small Federal Union somewhat in the nature of the American Union. Two of them, the Canadas, had separate or denominational schools, and the Catholic delegates at the Conference for the Union looked after the Catholic minority in Western Canada, whilst the Protestant delegates were equally anxious for the Protestants living among the French Canadians. The result was, both minorities were protected against future invasion of their school laws. The Act which united the Canadas and the other two Provinces was an Imperial Act,<sup>1</sup> and its guarantees cannot be disturbed unless by a repealing Act of the Imperial Parliament.

The clause in the Imperial Act is as follows :

93. In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to Education, subject and according to the following provisions :

(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province of the Union. [1867.]

(2.) All the powers, privileges and duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.

(3.) Where in any Province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any Act or decision of any Provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to Education.

(4.) In case any such Provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper Provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

It will be seen from this how safe the Separate School Law is from any local encroachment.<sup>2</sup> It stands with the Canadian Constitu-

<sup>1</sup> 30 and 31 Vic., cap. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ordinarily in Canada if a Provincial Act is beyond the competency of its Legislature, or *ultra vires*, it is vetoed by the Central Government at Ottawa; but if such Act refer to these schools, it is not disallowed in that way, but is dealt with as an appeal



tion, but it may fall with it. It is unaffected by local agitation or by local legislation in the Province, though it may be, and has been, amended at the instance of the proper authorities. Being a law for a "denomination," to use the word of the statute, no government would proceed to enact any amendment to it unless at the request of the heads of that denomination. This secures the law from any hasty or ill-considered changes, and leaves to the ecclesiastical authorities the proper guidance in educational affairs.

---

### THE SO-CALLED PROBLEM OF EVIL—A PROTEST.

"It is a most salutary thing, under this temptation to self-conceit, to be reminded that in all the highest qualifications of human excellence we have been far outdone, by men who lived centuries ago."—CARD. NEWMAN.

"Vielen gefallen ist schlimm."—SCHILLER.

**I**T may sound a little cruel, but there is no answer more effective and oftentimes more truly kind than to beg a too voluble questioner to state his difficulty. It is a veritable red rag to him. Has he not been stating his difficulty for the last half hour? and now he is coolly requested, not to restate it—that might be construed as a compliment—but simply to make himself intelligible. "Where's your difficulty?" is one of the most exasperating things that can be said, especially when accompanied with a certain inflection of voice. For the moment the position of the person consulted is forgotten in the greatness of the snub. Resentment blinds us to the reasonableness of his request; and even though light were given us to see this much, it is doubtful whether our will would comply. Some, indeed, try to seem at their ease and laugh it off, but a tell-tale flush overspreads their face, and in the look with which they regard the ancient man, those qualities of reverence and love so much recommended to youth are conspicuously absent. If wise and sufficiently heroic, the young man will pause a moment to rally from the rebuff, but if neither wise nor heroic, his alleged difficulty will be reiterated with the added

---

to the Governor-General. The difference may be important in one respect, as the parties affected could be heard on the appeal; the disallowance is a ministerial act of the Privy Council of Canada, and is done in the secret way in which all such acts are conducted.

velocity and lessened lucidity due to vexation, and the old man must continue to listen, though still unable to follow.

There is another form of trial to which a youth with difficulties is liable. He may have worked very hard at some problem and come to the conclusion that it is insoluble, a very satisfactory conclusion at times to come to. It is a mistake to suppose that the mind can find gratification only in the discovery of the powers it possesses. Now-a-days at least, men grow almost hilarious over the discovery of their incapacity for truth. They are delighted to prove to themselves and others that all of us are very small indeed. They grow wroth over the old Ptolemaic system, were it only because it unduly exalted man's position in the physical world.<sup>1</sup> In their self-depreciation they turn admiringly to physical law and offer it a place above the thing called mind, which they regard suspiciously and praise grudgingly. They love darkness and the lowest place, and are proud to admit that they are in it. Into the causes of this strange parody of humility we cannot now enter. We only observe in passing the curious fact that never before in the history of the world was man made so much of as the centre of the universe of God.<sup>2</sup> Our student, then, with the problem is in the above happy frame of mind. He has found the insoluble something that baffles his mind, and therefore the minds of all men, and so far he is satisfied. For such a one there may be a terrible shock in store. If the grave old man of our first parable be consulted, it is just possible that he will remark: "Of couse it can be solved. It has been solved scores of times. Let me show you." The words may be spoken innocently, but they rankle deeply. The slightest discoverer, if he be attached to his own opinion, as some discoverers are, will reason somewhat after this fashion: My mind has been given to that problem as no other mind ever was. I have pronounced it to be insoluble. It *is* insoluble, and no one has a right to imagine that he or anybody else has solved it. Don't tell me the thing has been done. It never was and never can be.

This picture may give some idea of the reluctance with which we approach one of the so-called insoluble problems. One is pretty sure to give offence by calling it comparatively easy, or even by hinting that it is in a very great measure solved. Yet with all the good will in the world, we cannot but think that it is so. In the face of the irresistible force of the reasoning of a St. Augustine and a St. Thomas, it would be the merest hypocrisy to acquiesce in the epi-

<sup>1</sup> Man's place in the physical world is treated by St. Thomas in the spirit of the true Rationalist. "Multo plus excedit *Anima Rationalis* corpora cœlestia quam ipsa excedunt corpus humanum. Unde non est inconveniens si corpora cœlestia propter hominem esse facta dicantur, non tamen sicut propter principalem finem." *Suppl. ad Summam, Quest. 91, 3.*

<sup>2</sup> For a lamentable proof of this, see Archdeacon Farrar's work, *Eternal Hope*.

thets that are designed to convey the stupendousness and insolubility of the problem. It may be so in a sense not at all contemplated by the users of these big words—this sense we may have to consider later—but in the meaning intended by modern writers it is neither stupendous nor insoluble. What Dr. Martineau says of the youths who, thanks to Darwin, are not going to be caught in the trap of “Final Causes,” and must have their fling at Paley and the Bridgewater treatises, we may be permitted to say in an applied form of most of those who bandy about the phrase, the Problem of Evil. Dr. Martineau writes (“A Study of Religion.” Preface):<sup>1</sup> “It is probable that of those who speak in this way nine out of ten have never read the books with which they deal so flippantly.” We, on the other hand, shall not be far below the mark if we put the proportion of those who have any clear understanding of the real meaning of the hackneyed phrase, problem of evil, at one in a thousand. One book, which will have to be mentioned again, has just been published, bearing that very name. The author, Mr. Greenleaf Thompson, might as well have called it “Problems in Mechanics” for all the relevancy of the argument. Early in the book (p. 26) he says the problem is quite insoluble, and abandons the attempt accordingly. Yet the book goes on for 250 pages more. The two Mills<sup>2</sup> were too overcome by their aimless indignation against an imaginary God to bequeath us any contributions of value on the subject of evil, physical or moral, and the literary sentimentality of Archdeacon Farrar is equally barren of results.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Probably nowhere in the whole range of English philosophy will be found such a masterly solution of some modern difficulties concerning evil as in the pages of Dr. Martineau (*Ibid.*, vol. 2, c. 3). We had intended giving some extracts, but it would be difficult to make a selection from a chapter which, for a combination of subtlety of thought, brilliancy of diction and playful fancy, is one of the masterpieces of recent literature. The author unconsciously, it would seem, applies many principles of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and thus adds vastly to their practical force. A study of these principles, coupled with an application of them under the able guidance of Dr. Martineau, will be found to fortify the true philosophy of evil against any possible attack. We may add that Dr. Martineau strongly deprecates the passionate and foolish spirit in which the problem is so often approached.

Like Dugald Stewart, he is quite ready to admit that the problem is by no means as difficult as it is represented.

One slightly adverse criticism may be offered. The large space devoted by Dr. Martineau to the treatment of animal pain seems altogether disproportionate. However, it may be said that modern Humanitarianism rendered it necessary.

<sup>2</sup> *Autobiography of J. S. Mill*, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> In *Eternal Hope*, Sermon 3, Archdeacon Farrar, evidently under the influence of excitement, which seems not to have subsided between the preaching of the sermon and the publication of the book, thus expresses himself: “St. Thomas lent his saintly name to what I can only call the abominable fancy,” etc., etc. Neither St. Thomas’s saintliness nor fancy is here in the least concerned, only his logic. His particular



A famous stanza of Tennyson's is perhaps the very best illustration of the wild obscurity with which modern philosophy has surrounded this question as though to make examination impossible. Compressed into four lines by the poet's marvellous power, the very essence of modern thought on a momentous subject stands revealed. Words like these have probably done as much to foster a false philosophy of evil as Shakespeare's plea for the beetle and its pangs has done for a false Humanitarianism:

[He] thought that God was love indeed,  
And love Creation's only law,  
While Nature, red in tooth and claw  
With ravin, shrieked against his creed.

A few remarks on this may be subjoined.

There is a voice heard above the shriek of Lord Tennyson's Nature—for we cannot believe that it is Nature herself, so sweet and stately—and that is the loud protest of the Philosophy of Religion and Common Sense.

Compare the poet of the 103d Psalm and judge, not only whose is the saner philosophy, but whose the truer art. "Thou waterest the hills from thy upper rooms, the earth shall be filled with the fruit of thy words, bringing forth grass for cattle and herb for the service of man, that thou mayest bring bread out of the earth and that wine may cheer the heart of man. . . . Thou hast appointed darkness and it is night; in it shall all the bears of the forest roam, young lions roaring after their prey and *seeking their meat from God.*"

And next hear Common Sense. "The life of the lion," says St. Thomas in his robust way, "could not be preserved but by the killing of the ass" (Summa, Pars i., 48, 2); and again: "Some would say that the nature of fire was bad, because it burned the house of some poor man." This strange opinion, as he calls it, he attributes to the "Ancients," "because they did not consider universal causes, but only particular causes of particular events" (Ibid., Pars i., 49, 2).

The whirligig of time, indeed, brings round its revenges, and Lord Tennyson, the representative of our highly-evolved selves, must be classed under the now slightly opprobrious name of "Ancients."

---

conclusion about lost souls is infallibly deduced from premises which Archdeacon Farrar himself must grant.

Mr. Leckey's mode of attack on the same passage is—

(1) To quote only two lines.

(2) To mutilate these two lines.

(3) To print five words of these two mutilated lines in capitals of horror (*Hist. Rationalism*, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 350).

Another, perhaps it might be called a lower, form of common sense has still to make its reckoning with Lord Tennyson. It asks: Do you or do you not do wrong in ordering a red-handed butcher to kill your meat? Do you not make Nature shriek? We think that nature (with a small n) would shriek louder if the "bleeding business" were *not* done.

But it is not from writers of books or poetry that the modern spirit is best caught. The heterogeneous mass of literature that is ever falling from a glutted press on a glutted world is better for the purpose. It is from newspapers and periodicals, supplemented by the information gained from odds and ends of discussion, shakes of the head, smiles of disbelief and sighs over life, that we come to form a very true estimate of popular views of evil. Judging by these criteria, the demand for articles that can in some way or another be called problems, with a dash of evil in them, is going briskly on. To minds capable of anything like ultimate analysis, they are reducible to a very few—witness the ceaseless and wholly unnecessary multiplication of so-called religious problems—but the multifarious ways of describing them, and the colors in which modern literature revels, give them an air of reality to which they have no intrinsic title.

All the metaphorical resources of the English language—that most untruthful instrument of the most truthful race under the sun—are exhausted in the attempt to portray the strange manners and customs of problems. We have Problems Religious, Philosophical, Scientific, Social, Economic, and, dreadful to say, Comic or Comical Problems; Problems that confront us like sturdy beggars—Problems that demand solution, that menace, that haunt, that bewilder, that overpower, that make life unendurable (so it is said), that assume every shape and form and monstrous feature, perplexing, importunate, complicated, hopeless, insoluble Problems—and the greatest of them all is Evil.

There is a language of problems growing up apace, and lamentations over the "hideous enigmas" of life bid fair to generate a literary screaminess and philosophical slang. After all, apart from shams and phrases, the world is luminous still, with the simplicity and symmetry of God's handiwork. The darkness over it is but necessary and bountiful; it is necessary as the consequence of our limited being. Were the world all light to us, the world were miserably little. And the darkness is bountiful as the occasion of the nobility of self-surrender, the heroism of suffering and the divinity of compassion. Hideousness there is, but this is not part of the darkness; it is part of the very distinct and palpable reality of human sin. Wild invective confounds this harmless darkness with this hideous sin, until the world begins to think

itself grievously ill-used at the hands of God. At this point undisciplined speculation and unchastened language rush blindly in, and thrust aside the realities of life, and the world becomes far more unhappy because of its man-made theories than because of its God-made facts.

After such a Babel, no wonder that the tones from the past are welcome, for they are low and mellow and sweet to the jangling that vexes ear and spirit, but they are too gentle to drown it, and Shakespeare may sing and St. Thomas teach unheard:

“There is a soul of goodness in things evil,  
Would man observingly distil it out.”

“Respondeo dicendum quod malum non potest esse nisi in bono. . . . Respondeo dicendum quod causa mali est bonum. . . . Respondeo dicendum quod Deus causando bonum ordinis universi, ex consequenti et quasi per accidens<sup>1</sup> causat corruptiones rerum.”<sup>2</sup>

We fail, as we said, to sympathize with the language used about this so-called terrible problem. It sounds, in too many cases, loose, extravagant and hollow. The questions, Where is your difficulty? Has it not been in great measure solved? rise to one's lips. We know, of course, the penalty that is attached to the utterance of an opinion somewhat adverse to the age's idea of itself. The gently abusive powers of modern English—one would rather fall under the good old knock-him-on-the-head style of criticism—are put in requisition against the man who cannot feel, as it is said, with the age. He is out of touch with the modern spirit, incapable of seeing two sides to a question, blind to the signs of the times, deaf to the cry of struggling humanity, his altruistic growth stunted, and one side of his nature uncultivated. Alas, alas! Why will not these accusers, replete with these phrases and flouts, “deafened with the clamor of their own dear groans,” remember that we are debtors not only to the generation in which we live, but also to the minds of the thinkers of old? We have obligations to both. We are not free to treat the dead ill because they will not feel it. They indeed are beyond the reach of injustice and the chill of neglect, and it is well; for there where they fought on the sacred battlefield of truth, a noisy crowd of gasconaders and philosophers is swarming, at one moment glorying over their comparatively petty conquests—those over matter—at the next cowering before shadowy armies of mental problems, inviting them to approach, then growing hysterical, turning and flying, contemptuously ignorant of the deeds of those who stood there once, not

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle's *κατὰ συμβεβηκός*. English helpless here. Perhaps *primarily unintentioned* gives something of the idea.

<sup>2</sup> Summa, I. c., and the *Quæstio de Malo* among the *Quæstiones Disputatæ*.



humble or wise enough to go to Augustine's "Confessions," that miracle of thought and tears, and cry out with him, "Quærebam unde malum et male quærebam,"<sup>1</sup> but supremely satisfied with themselves, insensible to the influence and uninspired by the voices of the mighty past. The clear and fearless gaze that in the old days of the combat of thought used to dispel the gloom is growing dim, and the strong grasp that once wrung its worst terrors from mystery is relaxed. "We have lost something in our progress," are the closing words of Mr. Lecky's great work, but they are not sad enough. We have lost the great bulk of the science of life, philosophy.

And there would seem to be little prospect in our days of any general effort to recover lost ground, or of anything like a successful solution of even an ordinary philosophical problem. In a progressive age we make no progress in philosophy.

It will be enough to give only one reason out of many for this rather gloomy view. It may be stated thus: Protracted logical reasoning and deep disciplined thought have become to the modern mind almost a physical impossibility, or at least our repugnance to such processes is almost insuperable.

This reason will seem a matter of rejoicing to those who derive their ideas of the logical characteristics of the old philosophy from writers who, to the delight of the vulgar taste, persist in identifying logic with verbal jugglery. Taken in this sense, logic, of course, connotes a low condition of intellect; and in this same sense many pages out of the old philosophers may be said to be disfigured. But such a state of things never was the rule in the great authors, but the exception. As well might one say that the average of Stoic teaching was fairly represented by a syllogism once discussed in their schools: You have that which you have not lost. But you have not lost horns. Therefore, you have horns. The staple of the great Christian peripatetics was sound and solid thought. The subject-matter of the thought may or may not commend itself to modern ideas, and we are far from saying that it would be desirable for us to devote our thought to exactly the same points. That is not the question. The question is: Was there immense power of thought in these men, and if so, do we bestow on the subject-matter that *we* prefer any thought like it? Do we? For some such thought, it must be borne in mind, is necessary for the attainment of any philosophical truth. To this question it is hardly necessary to say that no answer can be returned, unless the answerer has read something of the two schools which he proposes to compare. With this proviso, there

---

<sup>1</sup> As a Manichæan. Confessions vii. 5.

can be no manner of doubt as to the result of the contrast. It would be well if, instead of dwelling on the remarkable facility we undoubtedly possess of transporting ourselves to ages long dead and of feeling to a great extent with them, we should sometimes vary the process and call these other ages from the tomb and bid them live with and remark on us. We think, for instance, a resuscitated St. Thomas would soon master many modern problems, and at the sight of our decadence in the reasoning powers that he once found and stimulated in the educational centres of Europe, we doubt not that he would stand aghast. There is no other word for it.

Suppose he were told that eminent men of the nineteenth century expressed in print their doubts as to the sum of  $2 + 2$  in another planet, how should he not feel aghast? And in so feeling, would he be right or would he be wrong? Is it by reason of the prejudices of his old-world education, or because of his insight into everlasting truth, that the mediæval philosopher would be thus very literally shocked? The question must be capable of an answer.

Or let him be informed that the immense progress of science, of which we are justly proud, is stated on many hands to have necessarily impaired belief in the very existence of God—for, stripped of all ambiguities, this *is* the naked assertion of multitudes. He would probably rather disbelieve his informant than imagine for a moment that the educated and cultured human mind could possibly have fallen so low. Even when he came to realize it, how could he, by dint of strict reasoning, argue the world into reason again? He could not, for strict argument, to be efficacious, supposes a considerable amount of pre-existent reasonableness. All he could do would be to suggest some simile or metaphor suited to the tastes and capacities of the age. He might observe, for instance, that though the childish idea was exploded, that the noise in the sea-shell held close to the ear was the distant roar of the sea, still the existence of the sea was not thereby imperilled, nor the necessity of its waters for the life of fish lessened. Neither was God's existence made more doubtful, no matter what the discovery that falsified old unscientific notions on any physical fact in the whole physical word; nor was the necessity of His existence as the ultimate explanation of all life and being diminished.

This is all, perhaps, that even St. Thomas could do.

The higher processes of thought—let us call them by their right name, the metaphysical—are closed against him, owing to the mental conditions of his hearers. For the solution of strictly philosophical problems it seems to me that the modern mind is as ill-fitted as the mind of any previous epoch ever was, while, com-

pared with several ages of the past, which we are ignorant enough to decry or presumptuous enough to patronize, we aptly illustrate on these points the second childhood of the world. Over and over again, we honestly fail to see in pretentious books the veriest sophisms that ever were penned—*φανερώτατα ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡμῖν*.<sup>1</sup> One would think that we were incapable of taking the two or three steps that would often be sufficient to lead us to first principles. Mr. Lecky, for instance, the very highest type we possess of a philosophical historian and masterly writer, has repeatedly stated, both in his *Rationalism* and *European Morals*, that the general disbelief in miracles is not founded on reason, and yet is the right and proper attitude to assume. He does not see the fatal blow he is inflicting on the fundamental truths of true Rationalism. As a more general experiment, take any long chapter in a modern book on philosophy, and having extracted the gist of the reasoning, submit it to that most crucial test, syllogistic form. Two results will be observed. First, the precipitate of reasoning thus obtained will, as a rule, be in infinitesimal proportion to the amount of verbiage that has been evaporated; and, secondly, it will often enough be frail and worthless, incapable of standing the test of light, still less of handling. To exist at all, it must be put back into its wordy and deceptive covering. Let the same experiment be tried, say with Suarez against James I.,<sup>2</sup> and his one page will yield more solid produce of reason than the whole bulk of the other book. He professes to reason and does reason, and if he reasons falsely, he can be detected; the other professes to reason and does not, but it is hard to discover that he does not.

Yet there would seem to be some hesitation in admitting that we do not excel in reasoning powers. This is due to the fact that we have no standard of reasoning to which we compare ourselves. Hence we do not humble ourselves enough. Worse than this, no one will do it for us. In other words, there is no such thing in our day as philosophical criticism of philosophy—an extraordinary paradox, to be sure, to those who believe that the highly intelligent criticism which marks the literature, science and art of the century extends to the whole field of thought. However, it takes no profound knowledge of ancient and modern philosophy to be able to say that, considering the masterly anatomy practised by the "Schools" on one another and on outsiders, we moderns are utter

<sup>1</sup> Said by Aristotle of certain necessary truths. An agnostic will probably see in the phrase a contradiction in terms. Much in the same way Mill thought that the Aristotelian syllogism involved a *petitio principii*. It is a curious fact quite overlooked by Mill that this objection was met somewhat by Aristotle more than two thousand years ago.

<sup>2</sup> The title of the work is *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ adversus Anglicanæ Sectæ errores*, quoted by Mr. Lecky, apparently at second hand, as Suarez *De Fide*.



strangers to anything like true philosophical criticism of so-called philosophical books. This statement will cease to be matter of surprise if we remember that in every branch of true criticism the learned world exacts certain conditions without which the critic cannot be said to be formed and will not be allowed to have his say. Obviously he must know his subject, but in this knowledge the knowledge of authorities also is rightly supposed to be included. Never was the phrase, "consult authorities," so much in vogue as now, never was public opinion in the good sense so bent on seeing that the student should make himself acquainted with the authorities who have traversed and illuminated the same line of research. Men are on the watch not only to catch him tripping in his statements, but also to discover what authorities he ought to have consulted and did not. Indeed this coercive spirit is sometimes carried to excess. Witness especially the article on Evolution by Mr. Sully in the new edition of the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*," wherein every Evolutionist who has anything ridiculous to say on or off the subject has to be set down, ticketed, expounded, and thus have justice done him by the meek, long-suffering modern student. Friends, and imperious ones too, are always about to tell the critic in training that he should have taken down his Bede or Pepys or Blackstone, as the case may be. It is much to be regretted, they will say, that Mr. A. overlooked this treatise or that pamphlet, or presumed to sit down without his "*Littre*" or "*Dr. Murray*" before him. We are exquisitely sensitive about the honor due to authorities, and we form our critics accordingly. This rule of the republic of letters may be galling enough at times, but it has to be kept, and the republic's police are vigilant. If the great authority is right, he has to be read in order to develop and distance him; if he has gone wrong on a point, he has still to be read in order to be refuted, or some other authority who will refute him has to be appealed to.

Such is a part of the process of manufacture that a sound critic in history, for example, or philosophy, is put through. It is, on the whole, very salutary, and succeeds in fashioning men who in turn become real authorities. It provides that the unscientific element be eliminated and the highest qualities of the critical mind retained! The critic is now in the chair he deserves to fill, and maintains with an able hand the discipline of the department over which he presides. Inferior men will not, as a rule, venture to present him with flimsy and worthless books. Broadly speaking we may say that the high level maintained in our criticism of poetry is most effective in keeping down the growth of extravagantly bad productions in verse. Men are afraid of the critic. His periodical raids into the ranks of the great "unwhipped" are equally dreaded

and beneficial. No one now-a-days will seriously write a book to prove that John Dennis of Dunciad fame was a greater writer than Pope, or Colley Cibber a greater dramatist than Shakespeare. No one dare.

Yet what are we doing to form critics for the protection of philosophy and the terror of the wrongdoers and foolish who may trespass on this domain? Nothing at all. We do not form them, because we do not know how, and because, for all we know, Grote is as good a philosopher as Aristotle, or Mill as St. Thomas. We give no command to study authorities, because we know of none. It is not that we have examined them and found them wanting; we do not know the outside of their books, let alone their qualifications. There is, indeed, a vague notion that they are "discredited," but to be discredited is one of the worst forms of condemnation, and sentence of condemnation is lawful only after a hearing, and we never even professed to have given them a hearing. It is not as if we found in his first volume that Macaulay was untrustworthy as a historian, and then discarded him; it is as if a Frenchman, hearing the name of Chaucer, made no further inquiry, but proceeded to declare *ore rotundo* that there was no early English poet. We recklessly assert, "No first principles of philosophy have ever been established"—when we do not know whether they have ever been discussed. "Free-will has never been proved"—and we could not give a single argument that was ever advanced in its defence by its ablest defenders. "The natural law is a myth"—and we are utterly ignorant that a St. Augustine has thought it out, and that his arguments remain unanswered. If all these and scores of other truths are still regarded as perfectly open and unestablished, it is no wonder that the field of philosophy is invaded by hosts who cannot be more ignorant than the critics in command. They are free to say or do anything and everything ridiculous, because nothing seems ridiculous to those who know no better. If no one knew anything of history, how would it be shocking to maintain in a book that Alfred the Great was identical with Edward the Confessor? Yet it is no whit less absurd to maintain in philosophy, as some do gravely and unblushingly, that intellect is brain-stuff; if profound ignorance as to Shakespeare prevailed, who is to prevent us from saying that Cibber is as good as he? Yet this to one who knows both sides of the parallel would be about the same as to say that Suarez on "God's Providence" is no better than Mill against it. Do the upholders of Mill know the name of Suarez? Not till you tell them. Do they know that he is an authority? No. Do they know that he is *not* an authority? No. Do they know that his arguments have been answered? Yes. Who told them? Some modern authority said

that *all these men* were answered and discredited. Did *he* know Suarez? They don't know, but they suppose he did. Truly, without the check of criticism, men can and will say the most outrageous things, and without the study of the ancient authorities, there can be no criticism. Its absence in philosophy is a great incongruity in this critical age. More; it is a grievous evil to this would-be philosophical age, for philosophy cannot progress when its most rudimentary proofs are travestied or denied, and travestied and denied they ever will be until, acknowledging the impossibility of starting, at this age of the world, a brand-new and quite true system, we go and consult the older philosophers, not to worship, but honestly to examine them, and, according to that examination, to yield or withhold our assent. As it is, our position would be hardly tolerable were it not that our ignorance of our state is profound. Blissfully unconscious of our own inability to praise or censure judiciously, we look on while a company of fellow-blunderers perform in equally blissful unconsciousness the most fantastic tricks that ever made philosophy weep. There are few more extraordinary or more humiliating phenomena in the history of philosophy than the ascendancy over English thought exercised a few years ago by the Benthamite school. That miserable structure could not have stood for a day against the attack of an efficient body of critics, but there was none such.

Any kind of trick may be played with impunity on modern philosophers. Mr. Hallam ("History of Literature") gravely asserts: "The Fathers, with the exception, perhaps the single one, of St. Augustine, had taught the corporeity of the thinking substance." Mr. Lecky repeats the statement in perfect innocence. Professor Max Müller, with that blatant expression of general disbelief which is so unspeakably distressing to the higher type of the scientific character, lays it down in his "Science of Thought" that "there is no such thing as intellect, understanding, mind or reason." Mr. Jevons ("Principles of Science") fears that the existence of evil may be pushed to something like a demonstration against the existence of God. Mr. Daniel Greenleaf Thompson<sup>1</sup> in his "Problem of Evil" assures us that the free-will controversy has closed forever in the utter discomfiture of the upholders of freedom. If, he adds, we are not prepared to take his word for this, he must refer us to men of science; if we are disposed to suspect bias in this body, he has only to hand us over to the good Christian man—he does not say he was also a Calvinist—Jonathan Edwards. None of these men, be it observed, are in the least ashamed of

---

<sup>1</sup> "Of New York City," as we are told in the advertisement of another work of his.



themselves. Why should they be? They have usually acted up to their lights. They consulted no authorities, for no one pointed them out. They evolved all things from their own minds, because they were not told of any minds that were better. Then they played before critics, and the critics applauded because they were no true critics.

As are the critics, so are the books which they are incompetent to criticise. With the exception of mathematical treatises and some few scientific ones, we may say that books wholly occupied with rigorous demonstration and close reasoning are absolutely unknown to us. The dearth of such works is not recognized as deplorable because, on the principle of the relativity of knowledge, the lower intellectual functions which we see exhibited in the books we have, are not known to us *as* the lower, but as the only ones.

Let us not be unjust to ourselves. We can do far more feats than are enumerated in Matthew Arnold's meagre catalogue of Philistine achievements: "Doors that open, windows that shut, locks that turn, razors that shave, coats that wear, watches that go." In scientific and historical research and philological criticism, to mention only three things out of many, we stand immeasurably above all the progress of all the ages gone before. But it must be borne in mind that philosophy is wider than all this, and that there are in it vast recesses which we know nothing of, and to which we cannot possibly penetrate without an equipment which, as a matter of fact, we have not got. How does the able historical work show that we are possessed of great reasoning powers as such? It shows nothing of the sort. It proves undoubtedly our possession of extended knowledge, large sympathies and impartial judgment; and bristling foot-notes will probably evidence our inexhaustible patience in the examination of original records. But, valuable as these qualities are, they are but a small fraction of the capacities of the human mind. If Aristotle and Albertus Magnus were great naturalists in their day, and employed many scientific methods, and displayed some of the highest qualities of the scientific mind, they were also something more. They were deep thinkers about the soul, and truth, and happiness, and virtue, and good, and evil, all of them matters of import to men, and many of them, in the long run, of vast practical consequence. That "something more," which these philosophers had, we have not, whatever else we may have. We neither excel ourselves, nor respect those who excel in what is, after all, a higher sphere of thought. Our spirit of toleration has, indeed, softened the asperities of our language in regard to that unhappy class of men, but it may be doubted whether

the feelings with which Thomas Hobbes regarded them are more charitable now.<sup>1</sup>

If the above contention be at all correct, if the accuracy of thought essential to true philosophy be replaced in modern days by lame analysis and questionable logic, a corresponding loss in the clearness of our philosophical language may be looked for.

A word on this point may be added. If the charge of obscurity of expression is to be proved against modern philosophy, we cannot fairly be required to put on our charge-sheet anything except those metaphysical or purely psychological subjects wherein alone obscurity is possible; that is to say, all the clearness, for example, of Dr. Bain on the physiological parts of psychology, on nerves and muscles and organs, where there is no room for the crimes of unintelligibility, cannot be adduced as rebutting evidence.

Only one extract can here be given. It is not affected by its context, it is anything but a solitary instance, and it is typical of the language of Mr. Spencer as a professed metaphysician. So regarded, it would seem to indicate, on the part of English expression, an approximation to the rapidity of descent with which much German philosophy has gone down into the depths of the unintelligible.<sup>2</sup>

"The conception of a rhythmically-moving mass of sensible matter is a synthesis of certain states of consciousness that stand related in a certain succession. The concept of a rhythmically-moving molecule is one in which these states and their relations have been reduced to the extremest limits of dimension representable to the mind, and are then assumed to be further reduced far beyond the limits of representation. So that this rhythmically-moving molecule which is our unit of composition of external phenomena, is mental in a three-fold sense. Our experiences of a rhythmically-moving mass, whence the conception of it is derived, are states of mind having objective counterparts that are unknown; the derived conception of a rhythmically-moving molecule is formed

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoting Luther with approval, Hobbes says ("Questions concerning Liberty, etc."): "Aquinas set up the kingdom of Aristotle, the destroyer of godly doctrine." This from Hobbes, who was himself a violent opponent of Free Will! Again, in the treatise "Of Man," cap. 8, speaking of Suarez and other schoolmen, he remarks: "This kind of absurdity may rightly be numbered among the many sorts of madness, and all the time that guided by clear thoughts of their worldly lust they forbear disputing or writing thus, but lucid intervals." Most of the great scholastics, as we know, were furnished by the Franciscan, Dominican and Jesuit Orders, all of which once wrote and fought so hard that they really had no time for "worldly lust," which, by the way, in Hobbes's mind seems to be a hopeful sign of mental sanity.

<sup>2</sup> See one of the most intelligible of German works, Lotze's "Microcosm." Even in the admirable translation of the late Miss Hamilton and Miss Jones, Lotze is not too clear.

of states of mind that have no directly-presented objective counterparts at all, and when we try to think of the rhythmically-moving molecule as we suppose it to exist, we do so by imagining that we have re-represented these representative states on an infinitely reduced scale. So that the unit out of which we build our interpretation of material phenomena is triply ideal."—(*Principles of Psychology*, 2d edition, stereotyped, vol. i. p. 625.)

Neither Aristotle nor St. Thomas has anything to show to equal this.

We are painfully aware of the danger one runs in quoting passages like the foregoing, with the intention avowed above. Even to the politest of readers the obvious retort is open. "It may be to *him* unintelligible, but who is he?" etc. A personal reference is thus forced on me. We confess that at first we did feel in duty bound to be ashamed of the incapacity which failed to apprehend a great writer's meaning. Then we read and re-read. A comfortable suspicion at last dawned, which gradually ripened into the conviction that it was not wholly our stupidity that was to blame, but that the writer was, essentially and intrinsically, unintelligible. There are, of course, some who say that they can understand all or nearly all of such writing, but we must not be rudely skeptical.<sup>1</sup> To us, at least, less gifted mortals, much, very much of it, seems nothing short of glorified rubbish.

One thing is certain, that works like Mr. Spencer's mark an epoch in philosophical expression. It is impossible to conceive that a committee, composed of certain great names in English philosophy, say, Bacon, Locke, Hobbes and Paley, and appointed to report on Mr. Spencer, could do their work properly; the language of the 16th, 17th and 18th century philosophy is so essentially different from ours, that is, from Mr. Spencer's. It may be doubted whether they would understand one page of his metaphysical style. The presumption is that there must be something wrong, at least in his language.

Starting from one of the so-called problems of the day, we were led to dwell on a difficulty or disqualification which we thought existed in regard to the profitable discussion of any such matters at all.

Briefly, our reasoning and logical powers are not equal to the task.

This evil, we are confident, would be remedied in great measure by a studious and judicious reading of the great reasoners of the old philosophy, especially St. Thomas Aquinas.

But here our protest tends to become a plea, and this must not be.

<sup>1</sup> One can better say strong things in Greek, and not seem too severe; οὐδ' ἔστι ἀναλχαῖον ἃ τις λέγει ταῦτα ὑπολαμβάνειν.—"Arist. *Metaphys.*, iii. 3.



## WHAT THE LANGUAGES OWE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

AS language is made up of words, and as the Catholic Church is founded by the Eternal Word, there ought naturally to be a close connection between the Church and language. Doubtless all things were created by this same Word: "The world was made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." But the Church is His new, His supernatural creation, the kingdom of all regenerated in Him, His spouse "without spot or wrinkle." The creation of the universe cost Him but one word, *fiat*; that of the Church took Him thirty-three years of doing and teaching. This world and the figure thereof shall pass away, but the Church triumphant shall abide forever.

The Incarnate Word built His Church upon the rock, Peter, a new name, a word coined as it were out of Simon's faith in Our Lord's divinity, professed in these words: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" by which he merited to hear, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven;" and again, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." Faith, then, in Christ is the support of the Rock itself, and consequently of the whole spiritual edifice built upon the Rock, the Church. But "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Here we see language made the instrument whereby to establish, consolidate, and perpetuate that masterpiece of creation, the Church of God. Faith in the word of God is not only the foundation and support of the Church, but the very life of every member in the Church, and, therefore, of the whole Church. "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." "The just man liveth by faith." "This is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith." Thus the Word builds His Church upon the Rock imbedded in his own word adhered to by faith, and supports it by that same word, which, though "heaven and earth shall pass away, shall not pass away." Had we nothing more than this, remembering that words constitute language, we should expect to find a very remarkable relation subsisting between the Catholic Church and the languages.

But this is not all. When the promise of the Eternal Word was fulfilled, and the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, descended upon the

Apostles with the plenitude of His gifts and power, to enable them to complete and perpetuate the work begun by the Eternal Word, He appeared in the form of fiery tongues. What did this denote? It denoted what immediately followed: "And they began to speak in divers tongues the wonderful works of God." It denoted that, as they had received the gift of faith through the words of the Uncreated Word, so they were to use the same means, words (language), for the same end, viz., that their hearers might receive the gift of faith and be incorporated into the spiritual Body of Christ, the Church. It denoted that, since human means were wanting, they were to be supernaturally supplied with the means of carrying out their most ample mission and of executing their most imperative orders, "Go, teach all nations." For it is absolutely necessary for the teacher to use the language of the taught, since language is the medium of communication between mind and mind. But the Teacher of all nations must be versed in the languages of all nations. Therefore, the Divine Enlightener and Guide of the Church came upon the Apostles in the form of tongues of fire, enabling them to communicate by language the light of truth with which He filled their minds, and to diffuse on all sides the fire of charity with which He inflamed their hearts. Nor was it alone at the birth of the Church that the miracle of tongues was witnessed. It has been repeated from time to time through all the ages since in favor of her children, her zealous missionaries, dispensers of the divine word, as is abundantly proved in the case of St. Francis Xavier, St. Paul of the Cross, and so many others.

How faithfully the Catholic Church has fulfilled her sublime office of Teacher of all nations has been repeatedly acknowledged, even by those who are not of her fold, and, indeed, holds the most prominent place on the pages of history. The Head of the Church is always mindful of the injunction given him in the person of Peter, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." The whole flock must be fed with "the words of eternal life." For this there is need of all the languages, for the flock is found in every country in the world. The languages must hold a prominent place, too, in the armory of the Church in her spiritual warfare against ignorance and error. Each Christian combatant is told to take unto him "the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit (which is the word of God)." Every follower of Christ is a soldier, who must fight the good fight, and take heaven by violence.

The burning zeal with which the Apostles issued forth from the Cœnaculum, the ardor with which heroic armies of Catholic missionaries have since spread their peaceful conquests over the earth, the eagerness with which the Church now stretches out her maternal arms to the nations and tribes that are yet shrouded in igno-

rance and barbarism, were well symbolized, on the day of Pentecost, by the "cloven tongues, as it were, of fire." For fire is an active principle, ever striving to communicate its nature to all within its reach, diffusing around it light and heat, and always mounting upward. Such, too, are Charity and her eldest daughter, Zeal. They cannot remain inactive. So long as there are minds in the darkness of ignorance, hearts in the coldness of selfishness, these heaven-born virtues will go out toward them in floods of light and heat, bearing to all the knowledge and love of the true, the beautiful, and the good, thus refining, civilizing, and elevating them to the sublime sphere of their supernatural destiny. And such, again, has been pre-eminently the character of the Catholic Church; it is such to-day, and such it will be to the end of time. *Gratis* she has received, *gratis* does she desire to give of her abundance. She is the sun in the spiritual universe, enlightening, beautifying, and animating all; the reservoir of heavenly graces and benedictions, supplied to overflowing from the Eternal Fountain; the organ through which the Eternal Father communicates with his adopted children, the Mother of all the faithful, the civilizer of nations, the promoter of learning, the support of art and science, the friend of the downtrodden, the benefactress and liberator of the human race, the great central mart of all the languages, their union depôt.

The Church is intensely aware of the immense importance of her high mission as teacher of nations, and of the greatness of the reward awaiting those who do and teach; and, therefore, reckons all labor sweet, all sacrifices easy, all losses gain, that she may accomplish her task and be able to render a good account to the Prince of Pastors at His coming. Accordingly we see with what alacrity and devotedness the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church, from the very days of the Apostles down through every age, set themselves to evangelizing, and by evangelizing civilizing, elevating, and refining the world. Teaching is her first and indispensable duty, since "faith is the substance of things to be hoped for," the foundation of all Christian virtues. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." But faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. And how can they hear without a teacher, a divinely sent teacher, an infallible teacher? Only the Catholic Church is such a teacher, only she is stamped with the seal of heaven, inerrancy, unity, apostolicity.

The Apostles deemed it "not fit to leave the word of God," even for corporeal works of mercy, and therefore elected deacons "to serve tables." The "Vessel of Election" says of himself, that he baptized very few, "for Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." He writes to Timothy, "Preach the word



of God; be instant in season, out of season." The Apostles were cast into prison for preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ. An angel delivered them, and they went on preaching more forcibly than ever. They were charged by the rulers of the people and the ancients, "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus." They answered, "If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." And they went and "spoke the word of God with confidence." Sublime *Non possumus!* so often repeated since, when "the Gentiles raged, and the people devised vain things: The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes assembled together against the Lord and against his Christ;" aye, and against His Vicar on earth, the visible Head of the Church. *Non possumus*, cried St. Gregory the Seventh to Henry the Fourth. We cannot allow you to intrude your hirelings into the places of true pastors, nor see the flock intrusted to us perish for want of seasonable spiritual food. Some three centuries ago, it was attempted, on a large scale, to substitute the religion of Luther, or of Calvin, or of Henry the Eighth, for that of Jesus Christ, and it was proposed, at least, to modify this in several particulars; but the whole Church, assembled in Council, energetically declared aloud, *Non possumus*. We cannot change or modify the sacred deposit of revealed truth committed to our safe keeping, for it is absolutely unchangeable. Let the nations that will have the variable and varying novelties of man's devising, instead of the whole unadulterated truth, be cut off as rotten branches. And behold they have withered and decayed, and are now hardly recognizable under the varied forms of descending rationalism, of putrescent sentimentalism, and the dry bones of agnosticism and evolutionism. *Non possumus*, cried More and Fisher, as they ascended the scaffold. We can die, but we cannot accept Henry the Eighth as Pope, as supreme teacher of faith and morals. *Non possumus*, repeated all Ireland, after their bishops and priests, when, hunted down like wild beasts, they sought some secluded spot behind a remote hedge, or in the bogs, or on the mountain-side, where they might offer up the Holy Sacrifice, teach their flocks and minister to their spiritual wants, at the risk of paying the penalty of death for every such act, rendered treasonable by order of Queen Elizabeth. We cannot barter our faith for any consideration. *Non possumus*, said magnanimous Pius the Ninth, when the nations called upon him by the voice of public opinion to conform his teaching to the fashion of the age, which they styled progress. Then came Bismarck, ordering every Catholic priest and bishop off the Prussian soil if they did not accept the alternative of becoming tools of the state, and teaching its doctrine instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ;

and the bishops and priests, with one voice, cried out, *Non possumus*. They cheerfully incurred fines and penalties, prison and expatriation, by nobly disregarding that mockery of law put forth in contravention to the command of God. *Non possumus*, say the hierarchy and clergy of France to the laicizing tyrants of the Republic. We cannot consent to worship Hugo, or Voltaire, or any other such deity of yours, instead of Jesus Christ. We cannot send our children to your schools, where such abominable superstitions are taught and practised. We cannot give up our Christian schools; we must have Christian teachers. *Non possumus*, say our zealous pastors, and our fervent practical Catholics at home, to the voice of a miserable petty economy. We cannot send our children to their godless public schools, nor risk their loss of faith, more precious than gold, for any paltry consideration. Of the two evils we prefer the less—the gross injustice of having to pay for schools that are a public nuisance. For the time being, we will build and support our own schools. *Non possumus*, say those vigilant and conscientious parents, who feel the weight of their responsibility, to a certain class of newspapers and periodicals. We cannot admit your worthless trash under our roof, nor allow our virtuous family to read your vile articles and foul pages, where our holy religion and venerable Mother Church are maligned and vilified, virtue ridiculed, sound principles ignored, and scenes of refined immorality and scandal presented attractively for pastime. *Non possumus*, say those courageous youths whom the syren voice of the tempter would turn aside from the high paths of rectitude and honor. We cannot descend from the peaceful and delightful road of virtue into the low and crooked ways of vice and dishonesty, nor exchange eternal joys for momentary pleasure.

What St. Paul said of himself, "Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel," has always been the sentiment of the *Ecclesia docens*. Woe unto me if I teach not the nations. It being of the very essence of her mission to teach all nations, the Church must have made the study of languages a duty of primary importance to all aspirants to the sacred ministry. The Propaganda at Rome, of polyglot celebrity, is a specimen of the care and attention bestowed upon this important subject throughout the Church's long and grand career. Speaking of the linguistic powers displayed by the students of this distinguished seat of learning, on occasion of the late visit of the Irish bishops to Rome, the *Moniteur de Rome*, as quoted by the *Ave Maria*, says: "These literary productions, in language of every nation—from Hebrew, Chaldean, Persian, to Russian, English, and Italian—presented a remarkable proof of the cosmopolitan and civilizing work of the Propaganda. The recitations were interspersed with songs or hymns peculiar to the

country whose language was represented." It is well known that there are thirty-two languages spoken there. It is only the Catholic Church that could have given us that polyglot wonder of the world, Mezzofanti.

The Catholic missionaries were not content with knowing and speaking the languages of the countries they went to evangelize and civilize. They wrote grammars and dictionaries of those languages, had them published, and by their superior skill in the more perfect languages awakened in natives and foreigners attention to what they found good in those languages, thus attaching an importance to the subject it otherwise never would have had. "The missionaries of Central Africa," writes the *Ave Maria* a few weeks ago, "have had printed at Paris the first Ruganda grammar. This language is spoken by the people dwelling on the borders of Lake Victoria Nyanza. The missionaries, having no writings to assist them in its study, were obliged to depend solely upon conversations with the natives. The grammar is the result of three years' labor. A dictionary, containing six or seven hundred words, together with select stories and legends, was also prepared by these apostolic men, but, unfortunately, the manuscript was lost in a shipwreck. They are, however, actively at work in repairing the loss."

Thus has the Church been ever improving and refining and elevating the languages at the same time that she has been advancing the people intellectually and morally, socially and politically, individually and collectively. Take up any of the literatures of Europe; examine its origin, development and progress; study its genius, aptitudes and peculiarities, and you will invariably find that the Catholic Church has exercised by far the most powerful influence in bringing it to its present state of perfection. Bishop Ulphilas, between 360 and 379, translated almost the whole Bible into Moeso-Gothic, which is the earliest specimen extant of the Teutonic languages. He framed a new alphabet of twenty-four letters, four of which were invented by himself. The *Codex Argenteus* (rather *Aurcus et Argenteus*) is still preserved at Upsal, enclosed in a silver case.

In his *History of English Literature and Language* Craik says (p. 27): "It is somewhat remarkable that, while a good many names of the natives of Gaul are recorded in connection with the last age of Roman literature, scarcely a British name of that period of any literary reputation has been preserved, if we except a few which figure in the history of the Christian Church." But the first ages of English literature are equally remarkable for the conspicuous absence of other than names immediately connected with the Catholic Church. St. Gildas the Wise, the first English historian



of whom anything remains, was of course her son. There never was a saint out of her communion. She only put on a new and perfect form when her Divine Founder put on the form of man; she was the Church of God from the beginning, as she will be to the end. The next historical writer was a monk of Bangor, Nennius or Ninian.

Now of all writers who do not treat *ex professo* of language, the historian does most for the language of that people for whom he writes, in its earliest stage. He writes for the whole people, and therefore must adopt a style at once plain and simple, yet sufficiently dignified and diversified to meet the requirements of his subject. His object being to convey the truth of facts (we are not including our inventors of facts for scientific histories), his main point is to attach plain, intelligible signs to clear and fixed ideas, precluding the possibility of doubt or equivocation, the one thing most wanted in the first development of a language.

Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury, and first Bishop of Sherborn, who died in 709, who "could write and speak Greek like a native of Greece," is the most ancient of the Latin writers among the Angles and Saxons whose works remain. But it may be asked, What have Latin and Greek, which the Catholic Church has in some sort made her own, to do with the English language? Let G. P. Marsh answer: "The Latin Grammar has become a general standard, wherewith to compare that of all other languages, the medium through which all the nations of Christendom have become acquainted with the structure and philosophy of their own; and technical grammar, the mechanical combinations of language, can be nowhere else so advantageously studied," except, of course, at Harvard!

Hear Mr. Marsh again: "I do but echo the universal opinion of all persons competent to pronounce on the subject, in expressing my own conviction that the language and literature of ancient Greece constitute the most efficient instrument of mental training ever enjoyed by man; and that a familiarity with that wonderful speech, its poetry, its philosophy, its eloquence, and the history it embalms, is incomparably the most valuable of intellectual possessions. The Grammar of the Greek language is much more flexible, more tolerant of aberration, less rigid in its requirements, than the Latin." Remark here that, as intellectuality is the measure of language, great indeed must be the gain to all our modern languages from the Greek, and great, too, should be our gratitude to the Catholic Church for having handed it down to us replete with a new and transcending importance, its being made the vehicle of the written word of God.

Venerable Bede greatly enriched the English language. He

wrote treatises on Grammar, the Logic of Aristotle, Orthography and Versification, all which bear directly on language. For logic, in fixing the thought, fixes also the expression, giving precision, cogency and clearness to the language. The accomplished author of *Christian Schools and Scholars*, speaking of Bede's numerous works (forty-five), makes these remarks: "There is one subject which engaged his attention that deserves a more particular notice; I mean the labors he directed to the grammatical formation of his native language, a work of vast importance, which, in every country where the barbarous nations had established themselves, had to be undertaken by the monastic scholars. Rohrbacher observes that St. Bede did much by his treatises on grammar and orthography to impress a character of regularity on the modern languages which in the eighth and ninth centuries were beginning to be formed out of the Latin and Germanic dialects. Much more was his influence felt on the Anglo-Saxon dialect, in which he both preached and wrote. . . . Besides commenting on nearly the whole Bible, Bede is known to have translated both the Psalter and the Four Gospels. . . . Before their conversion to Christianity the Anglo-Saxons possessed no literature, that is to say, no *written* compositions of any kind, and their language had not therefore assumed a regular grammatical form. In this they resembled most of the other barbarous nations, of whom St. Irenæus observes that they held the faith by tradition, 'without the help of pen and ink;' meaning, as he himself explains, that for want of letters they could have no use of the Scriptures."

*Ex uno disce omnes.* Thus the nations of Europe to-day use the very languages that were, with themselves, snatched from barbarism by the Catholic Church, to vilify their common benefactress. But "the servant is not above his master." Glorious sign of the Spouse of Christ! "Blessed are you when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." It is unnecessary to mention Wilfrid, Boniface, Alfred, and other names of early renown in English literature. We have seen what Bishop Ulphilas did for the Moeso-Gothic, and, therefore, for all the later Teutonic dialects, and consequently for the largest element in the English language. We have seen what Bede did for the Anglo-Saxon, and accordingly for our modern English.

The next largest element in the English language, Latin, is altogether the language of the Church. Latin is one of the three languages that had been, in a manner, sanctified by touching the sacred emblem of redemption, whose privilege it was to proclaim the kingship of the Incarnate Word, and must not, therefore, perish. Like the Cross, to which it was fastened, it was destined to

be enshrined with honor, and to live a glorious life in the magnificent ritual and awe-inspiring services of the Catholic Church. It is a dead language to the worldling and to those who are not of the household of the Faith; but to the fervent Catholic, who instinctively recognizes the sweet accents of his beautiful mother-tongue, it has a charm that speaks to his heart of heaven and heavenly things. It was too near the adorable Head of the Man-God in His supreme ignominy, not to share in the halo of glory with which it was crowned in the resurrection. Now without the Latin there was no Italian, no French, no Spanish language. Without the Catholic Church, as everybody admits, there was no Latin, no Greek, no Hebrew worth mentioning, centuries ago. A few fragmentary fossil remains might possibly be casually dug up here and there from some buried archives or discovered in the vaults beneath a library cremation. But the Catholic Church touched them, and, behold, they live! The word of life has been committed to them, and she guards them as the apple of her eye. Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic and Greek had already been consecrated to the sacred purpose of transmitting the Old Testament from generation to generation; and now Latin receives its hallowed contents augmented by the New, and carries them beyond the limits of the Roman Empire into regions over which her victorious eagle had never ventured his daring flight.

"The introduction of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons at the opening of the seventh" (close of the sixth) "century," writes Noah Webster, "brought with it the study of the Latin. The cultivation of learning and letters belonged almost exclusively to ecclesiastics, with whom Latin was the professional language. Hence quite a number of Latin or Latinized Greek words passed into the Anglo-Saxon." So true is it that learning and culture have been introduced into the nations of Enrope, aye, and wherever they are found out of Europe, together with Christianity and civilization, by the Catholic Church, that in several languages a learned man and clergyman are synonymous. *Cleric* in Anglo-Saxon, *clerk* in English, and *clerc* in French, are instances, a fact which the *Kultur-kampf* in Prussia and the anti-clericals in France seem sublimely to ignore.

If Latin and her daughter French have, according to Webster, given four-fifths of its borrowed words to the English language, and if we take his word for it, as I think we may, that "if all the words in a large English dictionary were classed according to their origin, it would appear that the foreign or non-Saxon words make a decided majority of the whole number," we can easily calculate the indebtedness of the English language to Latin and the indebtedness of all who use it to the Catholic Church. In Milton's poet-



ical works about two-thirds of the vocabulary are foreign, which shows how much we owe both for matter and form to that Church which he so heartily berated with his bitterest invective. But this is not so strange for one who shone in the golden age of the "Reformation," when in this, its last age,

" *Cui non invenit ipsa*  
Nomen, et a nullo posuit Natura metallo,"

" Nature cannot frame  
A metal base enough to give it name,"

we hear G. P. Marsh lecture to post-graduates in Columbia College, N. Y., in this strain: "The Romish Church, too, in England, as everywhere else, was hostile to all intellectual effort which in any degree diverged from the path marked out by ecclesiastical habit and tradition, and very many important English benefices were filled by foreign priests quite ignorant of the English tongue." Indeed! Why, without just such foreign influence the English tongue had remained the barbarous jargon the Catholic Church first found it, and the English people the savages Cæsar and Tacitus describe them. If by "intellectual effort" is meant the attempt to palm off some counterfeit article for genuine truth, whether in the natural or supernatural order, in philosophy or theology, science or history, the Church has always set her face against it, is professedly, irreconcilably, necessarily hostile to it, because she is the "pillar and ground of truth." For "what fellowship hath light with darkness?" Chameleon-like or Proteus-like, error may assume a new color or a new form at every new moon, may defend itself behind the rampart of power and fashion and talent, may lurk in the labyrinths of pretended science, the Catholic Church pursues it, dismantles it, exposes and throttles it. To every "Eirenicon" her answer is "Peace through the Truth." From Gnosticism to Agnosticism, from Arianism to the last phase of Protestantism, Rationalism, there is not a single error of any note that has not felt her implacable hostility.

And yet Mr. Marsh is frank enough to make the following statement in another lecture of the same series: "The missionary who goes armed with the cross, not with the sword, must use a speech intelligible to those whom he would convert. . . . The Gothic tribes generally were brought to Christianity by arguments and persuasions addressed to them by ministers speaking to every man in his own tongue." Every word of this is luminous with truth, if *all* be substituted for "generally," and if the interference of miracles on some occasions, and of supernatural divine grace on all occasions, be superadded to the "arguments and persua-

sions" as prime factors in Christianizing and civilizing not alone the Gothic tribes, but all the nations that have yet been civilized. To call Pagan enlightenment, with its revolting ritual and low moral status, civilization, shocks all sense. "Corruptere et corrumpi sæculum vocatur," is the vouchment of Tacitus regarding Roman virtue and propriety in his day.

But if the lecturer means that the Catholic Church has ever been hostile to any department of genuine science, arts, or letters, the history of the literature of every country, and of the intellectual development of every people, gives him the lie. Roger Bacon is a fair specimen of the circumscribed limits imposed upon "intellectual effort" in schools established by the Catholic Church in those benighted Middle Ages. His writings that are still preserved, of which the principal is that entitled his "Opus Majus" (or "Great Work"), show that the range of his investigations included theology, grammar, the ancient languages, geometry, astronomy, chronology, geography, music, optics, mechanics, chemistry, and most of the other branches of experimental philosophy. "In all these sciences," writes Mr. Craik, "he had mastered whatever was then known; and his knowledge, though necessarily mixed with much error, extended in various directions considerably farther than, but for the evidence of his writings, we should have been warranted in believing that scientific researches had been carried in that age." It is well known that his writings anticipate the discovery of the telescope, and that he was acquainted with the effects and composition of gunpowder; but it may not be equally well known that it was at the suggestion of Pope Clement IV. that he gave to the world his "Opus Majus," so hostile was the Church from head to foot, then as now, to liberal education, to freedom of intellect.

We will now take an example of the extent of learning on the Continent in those days, and this from the Dominicans, as our last was from the Franciscans, two of the teaching orders of the Catholic Church. "Albertus Magnus," says Humboldt, "was equally active and influential in promoting the study of natural science and of the Aristotelian philosophy. . . . His works contain exceedingly acute remarks on the organic structure and physiology of plants. One of his works, bearing the title of *Liber Cosmographicus de Natura Locorum*, is a species of physical geography. I have found in it considerations on the dependence of temperature concurrently on latitude and elevation, and on the effect of different angles of incidence of the sun's rays in heating the ground, which have excited my surprise."

Jourdain says of him: "Whether we consider him as a theologian or a philosopher, Albert was undoubtedly one of the most

extraordinary men of his age; I might say, one of the most wonderful men of genius that have appeared in past time." The Church has reared a goodly number of such men in every age, and still rears them, and will continue to rear them; for she is to-day as radiant in youth and beauty and vigor as when she came forth, with the Pentecostal blessing on her brow, to regenerate the world, the fruitful Mother of heroic virtue and profound learning, of saints and savants.

Thus again speaks M. Meyer of Albertus: "No botanist who lived before Albert can be compared to him, unless it be Theophrastus, with whom he was not acquainted; and after him none has painted nature in such living colors, or studied it so profoundly, until the time of Conrad, Gesner, and Cesalpini. All honor, then, to the man who made such astonishing progress in the science of nature as to find no one, I will not say to surpass, but even to equal him for the space of three hundred years."

Albert himself says of his book on botany: "All that is here set down is the result of our own experience, or has been borrowed from authors whom we know to have written what their personal experience has confirmed; for in these matters experience alone can give certainty." This shows that Albert was not alone in his devotion to the natural sciences, and that experimental sciences did not originate with Francis Bacon. It also shows that, if such was the proficiency, under the fostering care of the Church, of intellectual effort in departments most remote from sciences that have direct relation to mental operations, and consequently from immediate bearing upon language, the Church must have exerted on language a cumulative influence that can be calculated only by estimating the immense impetus she gave and continues to give to the arts and sciences individually.

It is well known that all the great schools and universities of Europe between the 2d and 17th centuries were the creation of the Catholic Church. In the famous school of Alexandria, founded by St. Mark the Evangelist, we find, as early as 231, Origen, pupil and successor of Clement, teaching St. Gregory and his brother Athenodorus "logic, in order to exercise their minds and enable them to discover true reasoning from sophistry; physics, that they might understand and admire the works of God; geometry, which by its clear and indisputable demonstrations serves as a basis to the science of thought; astronomy, to lift their hearts from earth to heaven; and finally, philosophy, which was not limited, like that taught in the pagan schools, to empty speculations, but was conveyed in such a way as to lead to practical results. All these were but steps to ascend to that higher science which teaches us the existence and nature of God. He permitted



his pupils freely to read whatever the poets and philosophers had written on this subject, himself watching and directing their studies, and opening their eyes to distinguish those sparks of truth which are to be found scattered in the writings of the pagans, however overlaid by a mass of fable."

There does not appear much circumscribing of "intellectual effort" here. It was encouraged, like the bee, to gather the honey of truth from every flower in every art and science. Well does Augusta T. Drane remark on this: "The real point worth observing is, that every branch of human knowledge, in so far as it had been cultivated at that time, was included in the studies of the Christian schools; and, considering that this had been the work of scarcely more than two centuries, and those centuries of bloody persecution, it must be acknowledged to have been a tolerably expansive growth."

Yes, "growth" was stamped on every feature of human learning under the generous patronage of the Catholic Church, until it established its great centres in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Padua, Pisa, Louvain, etc. Of the "growth" of one of these, Oxford, from the day it was plundered by the "Reformation" to our own day, Sir William Hamilton writes: "Oxford is, of all academical institutions, at once the most imperfect and the most perfectible. '*Stat magni nominis umbra.*'"

We grant that the Catholic Church prescribes limits to thought, and says to the most towering genius or daring intellect, Thus far and no farther; but it is such check as reason herself imposes on such trespassers upon her domain as Mill, Fiske, and other agnostics, who claim that two and two may possibly make five, that truth is relative, that all that is unknowable which they cannot or do not comprehend, and such like absurdities. The Church has ever encouraged free thought until it has ceased to be reasonable, has rewarded intellectual effort so long as it has not become suicidal. Who has investigated the most abstruse problems within the range of human thought more freely, fearlessly, or profoundly than St. Augustine and St. Thomas? That Copernicus and Secchi were priests, did not hinder them from attaining their prominent place in science. The divinely-appointed infallible teacher of nations had too strong, too passionate a love for truth to allow any counterfeit impostor to usurp its honored place in the minds of men, under the specious name of philosophy or science. She knew beforehand the tough combat she had to enter with proud intellect wedded to cherished error, both in the service of a host of passions, and flattered by wealth, power, pomp and fashion. But, conscious of her strength, aided from on high, defended by

truth while defending it, her motto has ever been, *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit*. From Gnosticism and Neoplatonism in the Second and following centuries, to Agnosticism and Evolutionism in the 19th, her career has been one of conflict and of triumph. As Dr. Molloy tells us that he studied geology profoundly, in order to meet objections to revealed truth from that quarter, so St. Thomas studied Aristotle to meet Averroes on his own ground, proving as plain as two and two make four the absurdity of holding that all men have but one common intellect, the grand doctrine of the Arabian, whom his free-thinking contemporaries styled "the Commentator." This is the secret of the Church's devotedness to learning of every kind, always inculcating by word and example what one of her brightest ornaments has laid down in his worldwide wondrous little book: "Learning is not to be blamed, nor the mere knowledge of anything, which is good in itself, and ordained by God; but a good conscience and a virtuous life are always to be preferred before it."

Not alone must the *Ecclesia docens* be learned, the *Ecclesia credens*, all the faithful, are exhorted to be "always ready to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you." "Join with your faith, virtue; and with virtue, knowledge." Hence a good Catholic will be ashamed not to be able to give a reasonable answer to any reasonable question about his faith. Unreasonable questions deserve no answer; but may be shown to be unreasonable, or met with a smile of pity. Even *illiterate*, earnest Catholics have been found learned enough to give ample satisfaction to sincere inquirers, from their diligence in attending all the instructions of their pastors, whether in catechism or in sermons, missions, etc.

Now, general culture of the arts and sciences, which the Church has always encouraged and promoted, and in which her children have always excelled, must necessarily tend to improve the several languages. There is so close a connection between thought and its expression, the idea and the word, the signified and the sign, that the expansion, refinement, and elevation of the former are invariably attended, or followed, by a corresponding effect upon the latter. The enlightened mind ever finds a fluent tongue or ready pen, verifying the saying attributed to Socrates: "He is eloquent enough who knows his subject well enough." This is also a convincing proof that, with the gift of high intelligence, language was originally given to man directly by his bountiful Creator. Thinking cannot go far, nor deep, nor high, without its natural helpmate, language, as any one may find by experiment. Neither can language travel alone without intelligence, which called it into being, and which preserves its being by recognizing its significance. Lan-

guage is for intelligence, not intelligence for language ; and hence language may be dispensed with in certain cases, intelligence never. Language is necessary, because society is necessary. The Creator founded society by creating the family : He also gave it what it absolutely wants, language. Humboldt says that, if we accept not this, he knows of no explanation of the origin of that which is coeval and co-extensive with society. Upon this necessary connection between intelligence and language have I rested the above statement, that, but for the superior intelligence of the members of the Catholic Church, both lay and clerical, especially her Religious Orders, the three learned languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, had long since lain buried in oblivion. How could the barbarian hordes from the North, Vandals, Goths, Huns, etc., appreciate what they could not understand ? Their inutility had been their death-warrant. All had shared the fate of the Alexandrian library had it not been for the monks and churchmen of the Middle Ages, whose unwearied toil some are too enlightened to recognize.

The influence of the Church upon the various languages has been exercised in yet another way, which we are apt to overlook ; we mean the nice precision and wonderful exactness of her official statements in all her doctrines. Like her Divine Founder, the Church never has " It is and it is not " in her teaching. She has never need of issuing a *revised edition* of her former pronouncements. The Pillar and Ground of Truth, she stamps the pure gold of truth with her infallible signet, and there it remains truth for aye, unchangeable and imperishable as its Infinite Source. The word that is to be admitted as the sign of this truth, the silver casket for the golden gem, is also nicely weighed, adjusted with all accuracy, and sent forth on its errand under no mistakable colors. It is the same word for the same idea, and the same idea for the same truth, thenceforth ever after as long as there are people to use that language. So precious is truth in her estimation that she condescends to examine in minutest detail every word, and every letter and accent in every word, as in *homoöusios* and *homoiousios* (ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος), *theótokos* and *theotókos* (θεότοκος and θεοτόκος), marking the notable difference a letter or an accent may make in the truth conveyed.

Now this carefulness and exactness in the use of words extend through the whole domain of theology and philosophy. Words are not allowed to run slipshod under a haze of indefiniteness. Every pastor of souls, every priest empowered by her authority to preach the divine word, every writer who touches upon subjects connected with the sacred deposit committed to her keeping, must be severely on his guard in the use of words, that he may not come under her merciless censures. Hence the various



languages throughout the civilized world are made the special study of a large number of close students in the most perfect languages of all times. The result is a habit of exact thinking and apt expression, than which no greater gain can accrue to language. It was the want of this that Socrates charged so pointedly against the Sophists of his day. Indefiniteness of expression is always the shuffling contrivance of sophistry. Some, too, that abhor sophistry are under the mistaken notion that repeating the same word in the same sentence, or, if it can possibly be avoided, even in the same paragraph, argues a dearth in one's vocabulary, lack of skill in arrangement, or of taste to appreciate the charms of novelty. Such persons should never wear a second time, during the same month or year, the same coat, or hat, or shoes, lest they be convicted of poverty; nor drink coffee again till they have gone the rounds of all possible beverages.

If the idea is good, *i.e.*, exactly represents its object, and the word exactly fits the idea, no other word should be allowed to take its place. The surpassing beauty of truth shines forth through every word that is an exact counterpart of the idea, when this idea is in perfect conformity with its object. This conformity is found in infinite perfection in the Verbum Æternum, a conformity so unutterably perfect that all the beauty, goodness, and excellence of the Father is seen expressed in the "Figure of His Substance and the Splendor of His Glory," an absolute oneness of nature and perfections being common to the three Adorable Persons of the August Trinity.

And here, again, the Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church, in expounding to the extent of human capacity the grand mysteries of our holy faith, have poured a sea of light upon many important and abstruse questions connected with the philosophy of the human mind, its faculties, and their operations. For, as the soul of man is made to the image of God, there must be an analogy, faint though it necessarily be, between the eternal simple operation in the Trinity, which operation our complex nature must contemplate as multiple, and the manifold operations of our several faculties. Thus the light of faith, enlightening instead of extinguishing the light of reason, enables man to see the similitude between the Divine Word and our *verbum mentale*, which mental word true philosophy discovers in every act of intellection, in the completion of every idea. Every idea implies an intellect knowing and an object known. The Divine Intellect, as being infinite, must necessarily be active, and consequently must have an infinite object, which object is the Divine Nature or Essence, infinite being, infinite reality. Faith tells us that this Infinite Nature,

one and indivisible, is equally possessed by three Divine Persons, perfectly distinct and perfectly equal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Reason, also, shows us in our own minds in every act of intellection an image of this trinity in unity. The object known is one and the same to the intellect that knows, the idea through which it knows, and the affection or emotion consequent upon this knowledge. It is the same soul that knows as intellect, that is modified as idea, that is affected or moved by such knowledge and such modification. The intellect that knows, in the idea through which it knows, knows also itself; for the idea is the intellect modified. Known thus, the intellect knows itself in act, which knowledge is often expressed by the formula, We know that we know. This is properly an act of consciousness, the vaguest of vague terms in the hands of many recent writers, especially Agnostics, which, however, is nothing else than intellect cognizing itself and its own and the mind's present state. Knowing that it knows, the intellect affirms or expresses to itself this knowledge, which expression is called mental word, *verbum mentale*, in relation to the mind, idea in relation to the object it represents. This idea or mental word is begotten of the intellect in conjunction with the object known or mentally conceived, and, hence, is sometimes called concept. It may also be called the offspring of the intellect, though not of it alone, man being essentially dependent not alone on his Creator, but on creatures also, for every act of every faculty. This offspring exists as soon as intellect is called into act or exists in act.

These facts, which a moment's reflection upon our own mental activity makes evident, will enable us to understand a little, very little, to be sure, but still some little, of what faith teaches us with absolute certainty regarding the first and greatest of mysteries. The Father, Infinite Intelligence, knowing Himself, expresses this knowledge to Himself, and thus begets His Eternal Son, the Verbum Divinum, who, because of the infinite perfection of that knowledge, is a subsisting personality, the very "figure of the Father's substance and the splendor of His glory," at once infinitely known and infinitely knowing. This Verbum was conceived or begotten of the Father before all ages, *i.e.* eternally, because from eternity as necessarily existing as the Father is necessarily knowing; and, because so generated and so existing, is called the Eternal Son of God. The Son is necessary as the Father is necessary. Even so is our mental word necessary to every act of intellection, and exists as soon as intellect exists in act. Our oral word is but the outward manifestation of the mental word. This we are free to utter or not, as we please. God, too, was free to create or not to create the universe and all it contains, which may be called His eternal

word, "*Verbi enarrant gloriam Dei*," as also to utter his revealed word. But all that he has outwardly expressed, whether by creation or by revelation, He eternally expressed in the Uncreated Word, the Coëternal Son; "and without Him was made nothing that was made."

It is a mistake to suppose, as some do, that the oral word expresses the object directly and immediately. It is by expressing the mental word or idea, which represents the object, that the oral word expresses also the object.

In thus tracing the analogy between the Divine Mind and our mind, besides the incomparable distance between the infinite and the finite, in every particular, the following are noteworthy points of difference. Created entities depend for their existence upon their prototypes or the exemplar ideas of them in the Divine Mind, which are the measure of existences. Our ideas depend for their existence upon created entities, and are measured by them. Created entities exist in consequence of the Divine ideas of them. Our ideas exist in consequence of created entities existing. In conforming our ideas to existing created entities, which are all conformed to their prototypes in the Divine Mind, we are so far being conformed to the Divine Mind. But as everything in the Divine Mind is perfection, we are by the same conformity tending to perfection, at least intellectually. Therefore the proper use of our faculties in attaining truth leads to God, the Fountain of all truth, being led through creatures "from Nature up to Nature's God." Hence the pursuit of learning is a laudable one. Every entity is at once true and good, reminding us of the infinite Ocean of Truth and Goodness whence it issued. If, therefore, our will follows right reason in loving the good, every act of knowing is accompanied or followed by an act of loving the Infinite Good, and "to them that love God all things work together unto good."

Since words are arbitrary signs, having no natural connection with the ideas signified, it is a strange whim that has led certain parties to claim a vast superiority for words of Saxon origin over other derivatives in the English language. It is of a piece with "There is no spot on earth like the land of *my* birth." That there is more force or terseness in Anglo-Saxon than in Anglo-Latin words is negated by the fact that, in some of the choicest and most vigorous writings in the English language, such as *Junius's Letters*, *Johnson's Letter to Lord Chesterfield*, Burke's masterpiece, the Latin element largely predominates; and that they possess more sweetness, harmony or beauty, some of the best poetry in the language, such as *Milton's* and *Lord Byron's*, equally denies. We do not stop at the sign; we go to what it signifies. It would take a Herbert Spencer to see "the greater forcibleness of Saxon-Eng-



lish, or rather non-Latin English," or the economy of using "original words used in childhood," making it preferable to "have" than to "possess," to "wish" than to "desire," to "think" than to "reflect," to have "play" than "amusement," etc. No matter whence, or how, or when a word came into reputable use, if it expresses the idea clearly and fully, it is ridiculous childishness to put it aside in deference to any other. Give us the writer or speaker that has clear thoughts, something worth communicating, and holds out to us unmistakable signs through which we can at once grasp his whole meaning, and we care not if they are monosyllabic or sesquipedalian, indigenous or exotic, idiomatic or imported, old or new. Refusing a well-fitting word because of its origin, is like refusing to be clothed in an excellent garment on the plea that the material of which it is made is the product of a foreign soil. The writer or speaker should choose that word which, by common consent, has become the recognized sign of his idea, on receipt of which the hearer or reader forms in his own mind the corresponding idea. Thus the two minds are so far at one, being conformed to the same sign, the one matching the sign to his idea, the other matching his idea to the sign, and consequently represent to themselves the same identical object.

We are too near the utmost limits of a review article to even touch upon some of the many philological vagaries put forth as theories regarding the progressive development of words from the original inarticulate chattering of the autochthonous pre-human *mutum pecus*, Darwin's progenitors, to our inimitable *nonparcil*, "the well of English undefiled." Their first principle, that savagery was man's primeval state, then barbarism, enlightenment, and finally *culture*, culminating in science, is one of those assumptions of *Necessary Progressionism* which laughs at the idea of verification by anything in the past or present, its all-sufficiency being sufficiently guaranteed by its adoption by the Evolutionists. It counts nothing that the best poet, the best orator, one of the best philosophers, the best sculptor, and the best painter, ever trumpeted by fame, flourished from twenty-eight to twenty-two centuries ago. A thousand years are as one day to Progress! Their second principle, that all words have come from monosyllabic roots, is rebuked by nearly every word in the American Indian's vocabulary. Monosyllabic words being first in use, and men being first savages, according to these wise men, it follows that the language of savages should be monosyllabic. Therefore, Minnesota, Minnehaha, Mississippi, Missouri and Chicago are monosyllables. Philology! How wonderfully prolific!

## Scientific Chronicle.

---

### THE PERFECTED PHONOGRAPH.

IN the "Chronicle" for last January we noticed the announcement made by Mr. Edison of a new and more perfect form of his phonograph. Since then, the details of the new instrument have been made public. Moreover, two other perfected forms of the same invention have been brought forward by rival inventors. The first of these is the Graphophone of Mr. Charles Sumner Tainter, a gentleman already well known as Mr. Bell's associate in some of the latter's most interesting investigations. The second is the Gramophone devised by Mr. Emile Berliner, who has won fame and fortune by originating the secondary circuit system of telephonic communication now in universal use. In all essential particulars, Edison's and Tainter's instruments are almost identical. Their object is to record the vibrations of articulate speech, and to reproduce the sounds at any future period, avoiding, at the same time, the defects of Edison's first phonograph. These defects consisted chiefly in a want of distinctness in the articulation of the reproduced sounds. This defect was so great that it was almost impossible to understand the reproduction unless the original sounds had been heard by the listener. Some consonants, too, were much less perfectly recorded than others. These imperfections were due to the intractable nature of the tin-foil used for receiving the indentations, and to the fact that the same diaphragm was employed both for receiving and reproducing the sounds. Moreover, the great delicacy of adjustment needed in the original instrument made its results very unsatisfactory, except in the hands of an expert manipulator. In remedying these defects, none of the rival inventors have made so radical a departure from the principle of the first phonograph as that suggested by the writer of our "Chronicle" for January. The suggestion there advanced is, that the voice be made to put in vibration a diaphragm which should cause small holes to be punctured in a sheet, metallic or otherwise, in a way similar to those made by the electric pen. Then a current of air passed through these holes successively would reproduce the sounds. This method seems worthy of trial. But Edison and Tainter have adhered strictly to the outlines of the original phonograph. A cylinder coated with a specially prepared and hardened wax, in place of the older tin-foil, is revolved by a small electric motor, or other means giving uniform motion. Just above the cylinder, a diaphragm is supported which holds, on its lower surface, a cutting blade instead of the needle of the old instrument. When the mouthpiece is spoken into, the vibrations of the diaphragm cause the blade to cut into the wax surface of the revolving cylinder. At the same time, by means of a screw, the diaphragm is advanced slowly in a

direction parallel to the length of the cylinder. The sound vibrations are thus recorded on the wax, in spiral lines, in the form of minute indentations. To reproduce the sound, the receiving diaphragm is replaced by one of much lighter material, bearing a light needle that rests delicately upon the indentations cut in the wax. As the cylinder is again made to revolve, the point of this needle passes over the former path made by the cutting blade, and its diaphragm consequently reproduces faithfully the sounds before uttered into the receiving mouthpiece. Although the instrument is greatly improved, still, some even scientific papers have, we think, been too extravagant in their praise. It is certain that no one would take the same pleasure in a piece of music repeated by the phonograph that he would in listening to the original. Still, some have indulged such fancies. The reproduced sound, moreover, is so faint that in order to hear it it is ordinarily necessary to make use of a tube leading from the mouthpiece to the ear.

Mr. Berliner has departed somewhat more widely from the type of Edison's first phonograph. He goes back to Léon Scott's phonograph, the prototype of all instruments for recording sound vibrations. His stylus is a lever, pivoted at right angles to the diaphragm, and magnifying its vibrations in the record. In order to secure a really imperishable record, from which the sound may be repeated as often as desired, without impairing its perfection, Mr. Berliner substitutes for the receiving cylinder a zinc plate coated with soft wax. After the indentations corresponding to the sound vibrations have been impressed upon the wax coating by the stylus, the plate is immersed in a bath of chromic acid, which quickly etches the indentations into the zinc itself. There seems to be no reason why this method could not be applied equally well to the apparatus of Edison and Tainter. A cylinder of zinc, with the indentations etched upon its surface, would evidently form a much more durable record, and one much less liable to injury in the reproducing process than a cylinder merely coated with wax. Indeed, although Mr. Edison claims that "one of these wax blanks will repeat its contents thousands of times with undiminished clearness," we must be excused if we are somewhat incredulous. It is difficult to see how a surface that is so easily cut into by the blade of the receiving diaphragm should successfully resist even the slightest abrasion from the needle of the reproducing diaphragm, however light and delicately adjusted the latter may be. If, however, the zinc cylinder be objected to, or be found unlawful in consequence of the Berliner patents, would it not perhaps be possible to substitute for the wax some substance which, while receiving the indentations with equal facility, could afterwards, by immersion in some suitable reagent, be made to assume a strong or almost metallic consistency? Gelatine is an instance of a substance that hardens on immersion in a solution of alum. Of course it would not receive the indentations as well as the wax, but it suggests the possibility of an improvement in this direction. An electrotype can reproduce very fine lines—why not the minute marks on the wax cylinder? There are, it is true, many difficulties to be overcome in endeavors to improve the ma-



chine in this direction, but the value of the instrument would be so much enhanced that all the labor would be well repaid. Innumerable practical uses for the improved phonographs have been suggested and prophesied by the enthusiastic inventors. Most of these are probably more fanciful than practical. One, however, will undoubtedly prove of great importance, and will assure the instrument a fair sale from the very start. This is, to replace the stenographer in receiving all kinds of dictation, which may then be written out at leisure by the copyist, or with the aid of the type-writer. In this respect, the instrument will certainly prove itself far cheaper and at the same time more accurate and convenient than its human rival. In conclusion, we venture to assert that the "perfected" phonograph has not yet received all the perfection of which it is capable, and that, if a commercial future is once assured to it, hosts of inventors will invade the field offered by it for investigation and improvement.

---

### MARS.

So much has been said of late in regard to the phenomena observed on Mars, that perhaps a brief review of the facts and theories may be of interest. The analogy between Mars and the Earth lends peculiar charm to all the inquiries into the physical condition of our planetary neighbor.

Mars is the next planet beyond the Earth in order of distance from the Sun, and at its most favorable oppositions is about 35,000,000 miles from us. In this position, however, very good views of the planet can be had, and, as far back as 1636, dark stains were observed on the ruddy disk of Mars. In 1666 they were seen with sufficient distinctness to serve as indices of the planet's rotation on its axis, which rotation Cassini determined as taking place in 24 h. and 40 m. But this time of rotation has since been corrected to 24 h. 37 m. 22.7 sec., while the dusky spots and streaks have been classified as oceans and straits, and the bright portions as land. That the surface of Mars is diversified by land and water we are reasonably certain. Moreover, two bright patches near the poles are supposed to be regions of snow. This conjecture is strengthened by the fact that they wax and wane with variations in the Martian seasons, as do the regions of snow on the Earth with variations in our seasons. Therefore, Mars must have an atmosphere containing clouds. The presence of aqueous vapor on Mars was, in fact, proved by Huggins in 1867, who found, while analyzing the light of the planet, the characteristic dark rays due to the absorptive action of water-vapor. Clouds, too, have been observed floating in the atmosphere of Mars, and at times these mists so blur the disk that the observer must daily, nay hourly, especially when the local winter prevails, trace the details of the surface through transits of clouds. The atmosphere in which these clouds are suspended is much thinner than ours, for, since the planet is smaller, gravity is less there than at the surface of the Earth. A man weighing

one hundred and fifty pounds here would weigh but sixty pounds there. The atmospheric covering, then, on Mars is much sparser, and its pressure about two and a quarter terrestrial pounds instead of fifteen. In 1877 Schiaparelli, director of the Milan Observatory, found that what were taken as large continents were, in many cases, groups of islands, separated from each other by a network of canals. In 1882 this same observer saw these same canals, but with this peculiarity, that many of them were seen in duplicate, that is, a twin canal ran parallel to the original one. These double canals have been seen by but one other observer, Mr. Perrotin, director of the Nice Observatory. He has traced three of them from the southern seas to the north polar regions, across land and sea. No one else has ever traced them so far through land and water, so that, if these observations are correct, many of the theories advanced to explain them must be abandoned. Mr. Fizeau refers these stripes to glacial action, and suggests that the stripes are cracks in huge masses of ice, seeing an analogy between them and the rifts in terrestrial glaciers. As the planet has a peculiar red color, there would certainly be some difficulty in accounting for the red color of these fields of ice. The temperature of the planet, too, is such, judging from the variations in the extent of the polar snows and ice, that these glaciers should melt. Why, then, do they remain? It is equally difficult to admit that they are water-ways or rivers, for, according to Perrotin, they flow on through the ocean as well as through the land. This same difficulty prevents the acceptance of Mr. Procter's explanation that these twin canals are diffraction-images of rivers, produced by the mist which hangs over the river-beds. But, before any of these theories are rejected, more extensive observations must be made. The difficulty of the work may be gathered from the fact that maps constructed on the observations of reliable astronomers agree in but a very few special features. We looked, naturally, to our great Lick telescope to settle some of these points. Owing, however, to necessary delays in completing the observatory, no observations could be made until the middle of July. By this time the best season for watching the planet, namely, April and May, had passed; but, from the middle of July to the end of August Mars was carefully followed; the canals were seen, but there was no evidence of their being double. The story told by the Lick telescope is no doubt reliable, for it has shown its great power of penetrating the secrets of the heavens by following the details on Mars two months later than other instruments. Another startling disclosure made by Mr. Perrotin with regard to Mars was the submergence of the continent Libya. Later, however, he stated that the sea had receded, leaving the continent only partially submerged. Professor Holden, with his great telescope, found the continent as he had observed it all along since 1877. So that if any change had taken place, which seems doubtful, it certainly left Libya unaltered. That there are peculiar stripes on Mars is clear from the observations of so many astronomers, and that these stripes vary, appear and disappear, is also evident from the variations in the observations. How, then, account for these changes? The theory that presents the least difficulty

is, that they are due to differences in vegetation. The stripes may represent patches of vegetation which vary in size, or disappear with changes in the seasons. From ascertained facts, the surface of Mars is composed of land and water; the planet has snow, clouds, rain, an atmosphere, and a temperature not much less than ours. All these conditions are favorable to the growth of organic life; moreover, the spectroscope teaches us that the elements in Mars are the same as our own. Hence it is highly probable that there is a rich vegetation on Mars. Now, if the changes in the stripes are due to variations in the vegetation, they should follow some rule, they should be guided by the seasons and be somewhat progressive from the equator towards the poles. Such a change has been observed in the patch known as Hades. The stripe is in north latitude, and runs almost north and south. As Mr. Pickering, of the Harvard Observatory, has pointed out, the southern portion of Hades, which had been a well-defined stripe, entirely disappeared in the latter part of the Martian summer. We look forward, however, to other observations to settle these interesting questions, and expect the large telescope on Mount Hamilton to bring to light many details during the opposition of 1890, and the more favorable one of 1892.

---

#### A NEW THEORY OF SPECTRUM ANALYSIS.

THE "Chronicle" for April, 1888, gives a short description of the principles of spectrum analysis, and points out the wide field open to the spectroscopist who wishes to investigate the simple character of our chemical elements. Professor Grünwald, of Prague, whose work has been in this direction, has established a law which, by its simplicity and the number of coincidences, cannot fail to attract attention, and may become the basis of a future mathematico-chemical analysis. He has not only determined a relation between the spectra of hydrogen and oxygen, and their compound water, but has brought out what appears to be the fact of the chemical composition of hydrogen and oxygen, and the separate existence of the elements of hydrogen in the atmosphere of the sun. To understand the theory, let us suppose two elements, *A* and *B*, capable of forming a gas *C*. When the gas *C* is examined by the spectroscope, there will be certain wave-lengths of light, due to the element *A*. If, however, the compound gas *C* be united chemically with some other substance, so as to form a second compound, *D*, which will contain *A*, but in a way different from that in which *C* contained it, the spectrum of *D* will also have wave-lengths of light due to *A*. The wave-lengths of light due to *A*, in both these cases, are not the same, but bear to each other the same ratio as the atomic volume of *A* in *C* bears to the atomic volume of *A* in *D*. Professor Grünwald detects in the spectrum of hydrogen two groups of lines so arranged that the wave-lengths of one group multiplied by  $\frac{19}{30}$ , and those of the other by  $\frac{4}{5}$ , give the wave-lengths of the corresponding lines in the water-vapor



spectrum. Hence, he concludes that hydrogen is composed of two elements. If, then,  $a$  and  $b$  represent the volumes of these two elements,  $a + b = 1$ , the unit volume of hydrogen; and since hydrogen is  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the atomic volume of water-vapor, we have; according to the theory,  $\frac{1}{3}a + \frac{4}{5}b = \frac{2}{3}$ . From these two equations,  $a = \frac{4}{5}$ , and  $b = \frac{1}{5}$ ; therefore, hydrogen is a compound of  $b$   $a$ , which, on separation, will expand in the ratio of 3 to 2. The spectrum of these two elements can be obtained from the spectra of hydrogen. Multiplying the wave-lengths in group  $a$  by  $\frac{3}{2}$  we obtain the line for  $a$ , and in a similar way we find the line for  $b$ . Professor Grünwald has identified the line for  $b$  with the Helium line of Angstrom's scale, and the line for  $a$  with the corona line of Kirchoff's map. Hence, he suggests that these two constituent elements of hydrogen be called "Coronium" and "Helium." The primary element, "Coronium," must be a gas several times lighter than hydrogen. It is a strange coincidence that just as Professor Grünwald's theory was proposed, another law should be deduced from a different source, demanding the existence of elements such as the new theory of spectrum analysis points out. This new law is the logarithmic law of the atomic weights. It was explained by Dr. Johnstone Stoney to the members of the chemical section at the late meeting of the British Association. If, as seems likely, this is a law of nature, there must be three elements lighter than hydrogen. By like considerations to those given above, Professor Grünwald found that oxygen was made up of the hydrogen that gives the second spectrum, already mentioned, and another substance which he resolves into four parts, by volume, of  $b$ , and five parts of another substance which is again resolved into four parts of  $b$ , and an unknown primary substance,  $c$ . He has also resolved magnesium and carbon into  $b$  and  $c$ . This theory is startling, and although not yet fully investigated, still throws some suspicion on the simple character of hydrogen and our other elementary substances.

---

## THE THEORY OF ELECTRO-MAGNETISM.

To explain the action of two electrified bodies upon each other physicists have, for a long time, been divided into two camps; the one, seeing in electrical attraction and repulsion a confirmation of the doctrine of action at a distance, the other as strenuously advocating the necessity and therefore the existence of a medium. There was no empirical proof of the existence of such a medium for electricity. Since light takes eight minutes to come from the sun to the earth, a medium must be admitted to explain what becomes of the light after leaving the sun and before reaching the earth. But electro-magnetic induction was, as far as we could see, instantaneous, and even where there was delay, as in telegraphing and in magneto-electric transmission by means of conductors, the supporters of action at a distance gave an explanation. Something further, then, was required to settle the question. As all doubt about

a medium for light was banished by the experiments of Young and Fresnel, so, too, the experiments lately made by Hertz, in Germany, settle the question for electro-magnetic action ; for, if the phenomena of the interference of light demand a medium, assuredly the interference of electro-magnetic waves, as observed by Hertz, postulates a medium in which these waves exist. The German physicist produced rapidly alternating currents, having a wave length of about two metres. These he detected by the principle of resonance, a principle illustrated by the fact that regular well-timed pushes with the finger against a heavy bell will, after a short time, cause it to swing through a large arc. Hertz then made a circuit whose rate of vibration for electric currents was the same as that of his generator. His generator induced currents in this resonant circuit, and he was able to see the sparks due to the induced vibrations leaping across an air-space in the resonant circuit. The regular electrical impulses broke down the resistance of the air, as the regular pushes on the bell overcame its inertia. He placed his generator several wave-lengths from a wall, and placed the receiving resonant circuit between the generator and the wall, and in this air-space observed that sparks appeared and disappeared at regular intervals, due to the interference of the incident electric waves, and those reflected from the wall. We have a similar phenomenon in light, known as Lloyd's bands, due to the interference of direct and reflected waves of light. By this experiment the ethereal theory of electro-magnetism is established, and it becomes clear that electro-magnetic actions are due to a medium pervading all space, the same medium, in fact, by which light-waves are propagated. This is likely but the first step in a series of investigations that may throw light on the constitution of the ether. To it we may have to look for an explanation of chemical action, and, possibly, of gravitation. This discovery will, undoubtedly, have a practical bearing. In all known illuminating processes, there is with the generation of light a simultaneous generation of a great amount of heat, which, as far as illuminating purposes are concerned, is lost. We look forward, then, to the experiments of the many scientists who have taken up this line of investigation for a practical method of generating light without the simultaneous production of a large amount of useless heat.

---

## Book Notices.

---

NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF AMERICA. With Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays on its Historical Sources and Authorities. Illustrated. Vols. II., III. and IV. Edited by *Justin Winsor*, Librarian of Harvard University, Corresponding Secretary of Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge.

Under this title Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have commenced the publication of what they propose shall be "a complete and exhaustive history of the American Continent," from prehistoric times to the middle of the present century. The work is to be comprised in eight royal octavo volumes of about six hundred pages each, and is profusely illustrated with maps, views, portraits and fac-simile reproductions of historical documents.

In addition to the claims which the magnitude of the undertaking and the importance of the subject and the ability of the writers employed have upon public attention, it is believed by the projectors of the work that these claims, strong though they be, are overshadowed by the surpassing excellence of the *method* that has been adopted.

The method referred to bears the same relation to history which "the inductive method of Bacon and the comparative method in the applied sciences do to present scientific and philosophic progress," and which the projectors of the work before us think "have revolutionized civilization." They claim for their work that it "embodies a *true* method of historical investigation." Inasmuch, too, as the "labor of research in covering even a very limited period of history, precludes the possibility of doing full justice" to it by any one individual, they have adopted the "*co-operative*" plan.

In carrying this idea into practical effect the work has been placed under the editorial supervision of Mr. Justin Winsor, Librarian of Harvard University, etc., assisted by a committee of five distinguished members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, who have consented to advise with the editor during the progress of the work. Each special subject is assigned by the editor to a historical writer who, it is believed by him, is eminently qualified to treat it. The different chapters, as a rule, consist of two parts: First, a *Historical Narrative* sufficiently full for ordinary use, and which groups the salient points of the story, and serves as a text or essay which follows it. Second, a *Critical Essay*, which is intended to describe "the original sources of the preceding narrative—manuscripts, monuments, archæological remains, with accounts of their discovery, their transmission to later times, their vicissitudes, as well as the places, libraries, museums, etc., where they are to be found; the writers, contemporary, early, or late, who have become authorities on the several subjects; and a critical statement of existing knowledge" on these subjects, etc.

It is thought that the bias of each narrator will be corrected by the critical analysis of the essay. Each statement, too, of fact or opinion, must pass under the scrutiny of the Editor, who submits debateable questions to an advisory committee. In this way, it is believed, error



will be reduced to a minimum and truth will be approached as closely as possible.

We have described the plan adopted and the expectations and claims which the projectors of the work have based upon it at such length, because of the extent and importance of the field of knowledge which it is proposed the work shall include, and also because it is the first attempt, we believe, by means of the proposed method to get up a comprehensive, complete, and reliable history of the American Continent. The method is claimed to be entirely new. We are not prepared to concede this, without qualification. It may be new as regards the extent and comprehensiveness of the conception, but it is not new with respect to the idea of compiling history by the combined labors of historical writers, each working upon a special subject. But this, after all, is of small importance compared with the success itself of the plan.

With regard to this we would be more than doubtful from a consideration of the plan itself. Mere induction, even in the physical sciences, is incomplete and leads to no real conclusions unless it is joined with and supplemented by deduction. So, too, it is, and in a higher degree, in the domain of history. Synthesis must necessarily supplement analysis, in every true rational process. The inductive or analytic method rigidly adhered to in historical investigations will give us facts, but not their true relation or moral significance. It will enable the investigator to compile a chronicle but not a history.

There is a serious danger, too, that the person who undertakes to rigidly adhere to the inductive method alone—contemning and abnegating that of deduction—will unconsciously and without proper care as to his logical processes employ that of deduction, and substitute unproved hypotheses for true conclusions. To this danger persons who essay this one-sided method of ratiocination almost invariably succumb, without themselves being aware of it. For the man who imagines that he can employ solely the inductive method in his investigations of any subject, is most liable to be influenced by preconceived notions. This is the *proton pseudos*, the primary, fundamental fallacy of many of the so-called scientists of our day. The reason of it is plain. No one can think correctly or reach true conclusions who does not observe and follow out the law of all right-thinking. And to think rightly and truly requires not only analysis but synthesis, not only induction but also deduction.

These conclusions are verified in volumes II., III. and IV. of the work before us, the only volumes that have yet been published. The writers on the special subjects which each one has treated, and ably treated, give in most instances brief chronicles, and in other, but fewer, instances, essays, rather than histories. Giving them, too, as we do, full credit for honesty of intention and a resolute purpose to be impartial, we can yet plainly perceive in their manner of treating their special subjects, marks of personal bias, growing out of preconceived opinions, or prejudices resulting from the schools of thought of which they are respectively adherents.

We make these remarks not at all for the purpose of detracting from the actual and great value of the work—for to historical students it is of very great value—but in order to guard our readers from disappointment through their indulging in expectations which are based upon erroneous conceptions; and also in order to point out in what the true and really great value of the work consists.

That value, in our judgment, is not so much in the *narrative* part of the different chapters—for in that part of very many of them we frankly confess we have been disappointed—but in the "*critical*" part of each

chapter and its accompanying notes, etc., giving the sources of information, and historical authorities; illustrated as they are profusely, with cuts and fac-similes of ancient monuments, documents, archæological remains, etc., etc. For this reason the work is of exceeding value to searchers into the original sources of American history. To these it will be an almost indispensable aid.

That our readers may be acquainted with the fulness and comprehensiveness of the intended scope of the work, we give, as fully as the limits of our space will permit, its plan in detail. The first volume will contain papers on "America before Columbus," with bibliographical and descriptive essays on historical sources and authorities. The publication of this volume, very prudently and properly, is postponed until all the other volumes shall have been published in order that full advantage may be taken of investigations now progressing in the field of American Archæology.

Volumes II., III. and IV., which have been published and are now before us, treat respectively of "Spanish Discoveries and Conquests in America," with "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays on Historical Sources and Authorities; on English Discoveries and Settlements in America," with like "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays;" and on "The French Discoveries and Settlements in America," and those also of the Dutch and the Swedes, and with like "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays."

Volumes VI., VII. and VIII. are yet to be published, at intervals of six months. Their respective subjects will be: "The French and English in North America, from the English Revolution to the Peace of Paris, 1689-1763." "The American Revolution, 1763-1783." "The United States, 1783-1850," "Canada, and the American Outgrowths of Continental Europe, Dependent and Independent, in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries."

Each chapter in each of these volumes will have, in addition to its narrative part, "Bibliographical, Descriptive, and Critical Essays on the Historical Sources and Authorities."

It is probably too late to change the scope and plan of these latter four volumes. But if not, we would suggest that the work close for the present with the end of the eighteenth century, instead of continuing down to 1850. This latter date is too near our own day, and too closely connected with it, to permit of a comprehensive and impartial survey and exhibition of the subject. However, even though the narrative of this period should be unduly tinged with the coloring of our own times, the collection and arrangement of historical sources and authorities which the volumes dealing with the first part of this century will contain, will make them valuable to students of history.

To return to the volumes before us: The seventh chapter in volume III. seems to us entirely out of place in a work of this kind. It is not historical, except in a most distant and remote way. Under the form of a disquisition on "The Religious Element in the Settlement of New England," and "The Puritans and Separatists in New England," it is an elaborate sectarian apology for them. On the same grounds on which this paper has been introduced into the work, we might reasonably expect to find, but do not find, separate disquisitions on the tenets of the Friends as a religious element in the settlement of Pennsylvania, or the tenets of the Baptists as a religious element in the settlement of Rhode Island, and on those of Catholics in the settlement of Maryland.

Still more incongruous with the calm judicial spirit which should characterize a work such as this aims to be, is the so-called Historical

Narrative on "Las Casas, and the Relations of the Spaniards to the Indians," by Rev. George Edward Ellis, D.D., LL.D., President of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and one of the advisory committee to the editor. It is not, in any proper sense, either historical or narrative. It is a sensational, highly-colored sketch of the gentleness and amiability of the Indians, and their cruel treatment by Spanish adventurers, contrasted with the humane labors of Las Casas. It is full of rhetorical exaggerations, and of evidences of the personal bias and *odium theologicum* of the writer. Lest this judgment be thought too sweeping, we give a few specimens (from many more that might be quoted) of the writer's statements and language. Nor are they selected for a purpose, but taken as they meet the eye in turning over the pages. The early Spanish settlers are characterized—not individually, but as a class and without distinction—as "murderers, rapacious, cruel, and inhuman;" as having "inflicted upon hundreds of thousands of the natives all the forms and agonies of fiendish cruelty." This, too, is explained "by referring to the training of the Spanish nature in inhumanity, cruelty, contempt of human life, and obduracy of feeling, through many centuries of ruthless warfare," which "had made every Spaniard a fighter, and every infidel an enemy exempted from all tolerance and mercy. Treachery, defiance of pledges and treaties, had educated the champions of the Cross and Faith in what were to them but the accomplishments of the soldier and the fidelity of the believer." "The Holy Office of the Inquisition, with all its cavernous secrets and fiendish processes, dates also from the same period, and gave its fearful consecration to all the most direful passions." "With training in inhumanity and cruelty, the Spanish adventurers," etc., "thousands of the natives" were "crowded together, naked and helpless, for slaughter, like sheep in a park or meadow." They were "wasted at the extremities by torturing fires, till, after hours of agony, they turned their dying gaze, rather in amazed dread than in rage, upon their tormentors," etc.

All this, too, contrasts strikingly and broadly with the manner in which, in other papers, the needlessly cruel conduct of the early settlers of Massachusetts and Connecticut, towards the Indians of those regions, is lightly touched upon or left unmentioned, and also with the omission to describe the piratical outrages of English adventurers upon Spanish settlements.

There are other "narratives" in the volume before us which we think are open to like objections of personal or sectarian bias, but in a less degree than those we have mentioned. Nor can we abstain from expressing our regret for the partial and one-sided view that is taken of the character and conduct of Columbus in the "narrative" of his life and discoveries. So, too, we cannot but think that the insinuation that Catholics hold that "no faith is to be kept with heretics;" the characterizing "the Jesuits" as "diplomatic and insidious;" the styling of the Catholic religion "popery," and other like expressions, are entirely out of place in a work of such high pretensions. They naturally create a strong presumption against the impartiality and reliability of the writers who employ them. They certainly are grave defects, and seriously detract from the value of many of the narratives. It is to be hoped that they will be carefully guarded against in the volumes that are still to be published.

Yet, notwithstanding these defects, and referring more particularly to the bibliographical and critical papers, with their copious notes and illustrations (which we think are by far the most important), we regard the work, taking it as a whole, as the most systematic and painstaking at-



tempt that has yet been made to compile and publish a comprehensive history of the Western Continent. The bibliographical and critical essays, and their numerous references to historical authorities and documents, and other original sources of information, will furnish invaluable assistance to those who wish to thoroughly study American history.

---

THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH. By *James Bryce*. 2 volumes. London and New York: McMillan & Co. 1888.

"The longer any one studies a vast subject, the more cautious in inference does he become." This sentence, taken from the midst of the introductory chapter of the work before us, is the terse expression of a principle which it would be well for all writers to bear in mind and to adopt for their own guidance; then the reading world might be supplied with fewer ready-made judgments that are, for the most part, erroneous. Our author professes to have followed it in writing his latest work. "I have striven," he says, "to avoid the temptations of the deductive method, and to present simply the facts of the case, arranging and connecting them as best I can, but letting them speak for themselves rather than pressing upon the reader my own conclusions." And because Americans, writing of the history and institutions of the United States, have almost invariably ignored this principle, the best works on our country, its political, industrial and social institutions, have been written by foreigners. Even Bancroft impairs the usefulness of his great work by his evident purpose, implied on almost every page, of stating facts only for the sake of making them support the false theory that liberty is an essential outgrowth of Protestantism. No doubt, the vast majority of books about us, written by Europeans, especially the French and English, are worthless, worse than useless; but yet De Tocqueville wrote the first really valuable appreciation of us, and his *Democracy in America* still remains a standard work, though composed according to a preconceived notion of what, in the writer's judgment, we ought to be, rather than of what our ancestors actually were in his day. At least two other European writers have judged us according to justice, Herr von Holst in Germany, and M. Claudio Jannet in France, the latter being one of the glories of Catholic literature, who is far from being as well known in this country as he ought to be.

If for no other reason than that implied in the two sentences we have quoted, Mr. Bryce's book is superior to De Tocqueville's, though it is, by no means, free from errors of statement, enough of which to fill a page or two we could cull after but a cursory examination. In treating, for instance, of our Presidential election, he says that, on account of the obscurity of the candidates for electors, the name of a party's candidate for the Presidency is printed at the head of the ballots, while the fact is that such intimation to voters is really an exception to the rule. But, far more serious, in our view, are his references to Catholics and to religious liberty in the colonies and the States. At the time of the Revolution, he says (vol. i. p. 21), all the inhabitants of the revolted colonies or new States, "except some Roman Catholics in Maryland, professed the Protestant religion." What, then, of the thousands of Catholics at that time living in Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey? And what warranty has he for asserting (vol. ii. p. 567) that the creed of Roman Catholic Bishops "justifies the enforcement of the true faith by the secular arm?" This statement is the more astonishing, as Mr. Bryce is usually fair in his treatment of Catholics, with whose disabilities in the State of New Hampshire, however, he has not made himself, by

any means, so well acquainted as with most of the other subjects of which he treats in these two volumes.

But, in general, he carries out admirably the plan which he drew up for himself, when undertaking to write this book, the presenting of a general view of the United States, both as a government and as a nation. And his treatment is comprehensive, but not, of course, exhaustive. The latter course would lead the writer "to descant as fully upon matters he knows imperfectly, as upon those with which his own tastes and knowledge qualify him to deal." Accordingly, while passing lightly over some things, he endeavors "to omit nothing which seems necessary to make the political life and the national character and tendencies of the Americans intelligible to Europeans"; and, with this view he touches "upon some topics only distantly connected with government or politics." He spent nearly twenty years in studying his subject, and during that period he visited this country three times, and of these visits he tells us himself: "When I first visited America eighteen years ago, I brought home a swarm of bold generalizations. Half of them were thrown overboard in 1881. Of the half that remained, some were dropped into the Atlantic when I returned across it, after a third visit in 1883-84; and, although the two later journeys gave birth to some new views, these views are fewer and more discreetly cautious than their departed sisters of 1870. I can honestly say," he adds, contrasting his own with De Tocqueville's plan, "that I shall be far better pleased, if readers of a philosophic turn find in the book matter on which they feel they can safely build theories for themselves, than if they take from it theories ready made."

In these two volumes, of nearly seven hundred pages each, there is ample food for years of reflection. They are almost entirely devoted to a description of the facts of to-day. Mr. Bryce takes pains to tell us that, in carrying out his plan, he has had to resist the temptation of straying off into history; but he has written history nevertheless, for Freeman's *dictum* is strictly true, that politics is present history, history in the ordinary sense being past politics. Our author makes one brief historical diversion, but it is only because he found it necessary to do so in order to clear the way for a proper understanding of our political system, of which he has evidently made a thorough study. But even without history he naturally found his subject a vast and complex one; yet he has managed to arrange its component parts according to a plan which is not only logical in its order, but makes the reading of the book entertaining as well as useful.

"There are three main things," he says, "that one wishes to know about a national commonwealth, namely, its framework and constitutional machinery, the methods by which it is worked, the forces which move it and direct its course. It is natural to begin with the first of these. Accordingly, I begin with the government." And in the first of the six parts into which he divides his work, he describes the national government in all its branches, executive, legislative and judiciary; in the second, the State governments in the same manner; in the third, our system of political parties, and in the fourth the bearing of public opinion upon the system; while in the fifth part he gives illustrations and makes reflections, and in the sixth deals with our social institutions, including therein the strength and influence of religion in the United States. This we consider the least thorough and least satisfactory part of the work. Necessarily, some repetition was involved in the faithful carrying out of this plan; but a little repetition was better than the leaving of some topics in comparative obscurity. The evils of our sys-

tem, especially in municipal government, are pointed out in a good, not a carping, spirit, which should inspire our legislators with a keen sense of the necessity of correcting abuses that not only tend to the blunting of public and civic virtue at home, but also to the depreciating among foreigners of our entire system. Especially are the corruptions of New York and Philadelphia politics dwelt upon for this purpose. Valuable documents, illustrative of the more important chapters, are given in copious appendices to both volumes.

Mr. Bryce assures us that he has found it so easy to be non-partisan in his treatment of our country that, after reading his pages, we find it difficult to conceive how most foreign books about us are imbued throughout with the spirit of prejudice. He says that, in the first place, he wrote down what struck him as the dominant facts, and then tested, by consulting American friends and studying American books, the view which he had reached. He also claims to have discovered the cause why such a book as his has not been written by an American, who might naturally be supposed to have great advantages over a stranger. But, after mature reflection, the conclusion is naturally reached that "there are two advantages which a stranger, or at least a stranger who is also an Englishman, with some practical knowledge of English politics and English law, may hope to secure." What these advantages are, we will leave to Mr. Bryce himself to state, submitting his description as a fair sample of his literary style. Such a writer "is struck by some things which a native does not think of explaining, because they are too obvious, and whose influence on politics or society he forgets to estimate, since they seem to him part of the order of nature. And the stranger finds it easier to maintain a position of detachment, detachment not only from party prejudice, but from those prepossessions in favor of persons, groups, constitutional dogmas, national pretensions, which a citizen can scarcely escape except by falling into the attitude of impartial cynicism which sours and perverts the historical mind as much as prejudice itself."

Following these lines, Mr. Bryce has produced a book which leaves both Americans and English-speaking foreigners without an excuse for hereafter remaining in ignorance of our institutions and mode of life. How he has accomplished his task he himself describes in this pen-picture: "He who regards a wide landscape from a distant height, sees its details imperfectly, and must unfold his map in order to make out where each village lies, and how the roads run from point to point. But he catches the true perspective of things better than if he were standing among them. The great features of the landscape, the valleys, slopes and mountains, appear in their relative proportion; he can estimate the height of the peaks and the breadth of the plains."

---

THE TRUE SPOUSE OF JESUS CHRIST. With an Appendix and various Small Works and Spiritual Letters. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. In two volumes, forming part of the Centenary Edition of the Complete Works of St. Alphonsus. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Apostolic See.

The good that men do, the poet has said, is not interred with their bones. Fortunately for the world, the law is universal. It were, indeed, sad for the world if such had not been the case, and if the works of great and good men did not live after them to remind and teach us "how to make our lives sublime." Pre-eminently sad would it have been, and greatly to be deplored, if the works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori, the



crystallization of his wisdom and piety, had not been handed down to us. They may not, indeed, have made sublime the lives of all who have read them, but they have undoubtedly influenced them for good, and tended to draw them nearer to God, and thus have made men better and holier. Whether it be in the domain of theology or of asceticism that we consider the Saint, great is the good he has done, and is doing to the believing world. Few are the Church's illustrious sons, revered worthily and beloved though they be, whose memory is so cherished and revered as is that of St. Alphonsus. Many are the theological works that have been written since his day, yet to the great treatise on Moral Theology which bears his name we turn with a pleasure and profit that others with all their merits fail to give us. It is like going to the fountain-head, where the waters are coolest and clearest, instead of drinking of them after they have flowed along their channels for many a league, and lost their freshness and limpid purity. And, as with his great work on Moral Theology, so with his ascetical writings. Though old, they seem ever new, ever fresh and vigorous, ever instructive. Like the Church herself, whose spirit they breathe, they shine forth clearer and stronger with the advancing years.

In a special way these words are applicable to the work before us, "The True Spouse of Jesus Christ." It is some years now since this work was first given to the public in an English translation. From the beginning, its high worth was appreciated. It was doubly precious. It was precious for its own intrinsic value, and precious for its timeliness, supplying, as it did, a long-felt want in the lives of Religious in this country and other English-speaking countries.

The edition before us constitutes the tenth and eleventh volumes of "The Centenary Edition" of the Saint's works. It has been edited with great care and conspicuous ability. Though "The True Spouse of Jesus Christ" was written expressly for Nuns, it contains also much that is profitable and needful, not only for all classes of Religious, but for those also who live in the world. No one, in whatever calling in life, can read it and fail to profit by it. But to those who, in the Religious life, have given themselves to God, the work is particularly addressed. It aims at a portrayal of the *true* Spouse of Jesus Christ.

That for such a work St. Alphonsus was eminently and peculiarly fitted no one can reasonably deny. He was a Religious, day in and day out, specially consecrated to God. He was the founder of a Religious Order; a man, moreover, of unusual attainments, and of large experience in the guidance of Religious souls. He knew the ideal which the Church has set before her Religious. He knew also, from intimate relations with that part of Christ's kingdom, the obstacles which stood in the way of the attainment of that ideal, as well as the helps that aided its realization.

In the opening chapters of his work, he speaks of the excellence of the Religious state and its advantages. He treats this from a two-fold point of view; first, showing from Scriptural citations the preciousness of virginity in the sight of God, and, secondly, its suitableness and favorableness to a perfect service of God in this world. This second point he brings out most clearly by referring to St. Paul, who, speaking on the same subject, says that the unmarried woman and the virgin "thinketh that she may be holy both in body and spirit, but she that is married thinketh on the things of the world and how she may please her husband." The Religious state is, in the words of the Saint, as it is in the estimation of all earnest, thoughtful men, the surest way to salvation.

Not that the Saint says or thinks that all who enter into that state shall be saved—for he admits, and plainly says, that it has its dangers and pitfalls—but because of the protection with which it is hedged around and the special graces with which God blesses it.

Having treated of the excellence of the Religious life from this two-fold point of view, the Saint gives us his idea of a true Spouse of Christ. The espousal of the Religious he holds to be a true and perfect espousal, a solemn consecration of one's-self to God, a becoming thereby one with Him; one heart, and mind, and soul, wholly and entirely His. The true spouse of Jesus Christ will, therefore, be in heart and will, in thought, and word, and deed, in her whole life, a copy of her Master. His ways, then, will be her ways; His virtues her virtues.

Carrying out that thought, St. Alphonsus devotes most of the subsequent part of his work to a consideration of the virtues which so eminently befit a Religious, and without which she cannot be what she professes and aspires to be—a true spouse of Jesus Christ. There must be, he tells us, interior mortification; there must also be exterior mortification. The true Religious can have no will. For where there is self-will there is also self-love, and consequently not an entire giving up of self to God. On the humility both of heart and intellect, which Religious must possess; on the fraternal charity which must ever guide them in their dealings with mankind; on the patience that must possess their souls; of the great necessity of mental prayer—needful to a Religious as air is to life—St. Alphonsus dwells with great clearness and force.

There are some who think the Saint has gone too far into details, and that it would have been better had he not treated upon some matters to which he has drawn attention. But this is a grave mistake. Men are not angels; and sensible mortals do not look for perfection in this life. If, in the past, Religious have not been all that they ought to have been, it is for us to learn from their shortcomings that our duty is higher. This work of St. Alphonsus is estimated at its true value by those to whom it is especially addressed—the Religious in our convents—and, if there be one thing more than another for which it is prized, it is because the Saint lays his finger upon their weaknesses, and, having done so, points out to them the way to overcome such obstacles to the attainment of God's perfect love. Not the least valuable part of the work is the appendix, covering more than three hundred pages of the second volume. For the most part it contains Exhortations addressed to the nuns of Religious communities, and Spiritual Letters written to Religious and persons called to a Religious state. They are full of sweetness and wisdom, and we are sure will be fully appreciated by all who are in earnest in the work of saving their souls, and especially by those who have consecrated themselves to God, and are desirous of being His loyal, loving, and *true spouses*.

Readers should ever bear in mind that the author is a Saint, and therefore his words and counsels are deserving of far more than common interest. To what extent God inspired the Saint in writing this work, is not given us to know, but we feel we are not going beyond the truth when we say that it must have been the fruit of many prayers, and of much communion with God. The work, therefore, should be in the hands of all who seek perfection, who love God, and wish to dwell with Him hereafter. It will draw them nearer to God, teach them to walk in His perfect ways; it will be to them a lamp in the darkness, and a staff in their weakness.

THEOLOGIÆ DOGMATICÆ COMPENDIUM IN USUM STUDIOSORUM THEOLOGIÆ.  
 Tomus I. Edidit *S. Hurter, S. J.*, S. Theolog. et Philos. Doctor, Ejusdem  
 S. Theolog. in C. R. Universitate Cœnipontana Professore P. O. Cum Approba-  
 tione Celsissimi et Reverendissimi Episcopi Brixinensis et Facultate Superiorum.  
 Editio Sexta Aucta et Emendata. Cœniponte Libraria Academica Wagneriana.  
 1888.

That the excellence of Father Hurter's work has been appreciated we have undoubted proof in the fact that the volume before us is the first of a new and sixth edition. The Rev. Father tells us, and from a perusal of the volume it becomes quite evident, that he has taken advantage of the present edition to enlarge and correct his work.

We have not here the space to attempt a broad and thorough criticism of this admirable book. We do not claim for it the highest excellence. There are works on the same subject which we prefer. Still it must be admitted that Father Hurter's book holds a highly respectable position among works of that kind. His treatment of the great question of Divine Revelation is especially worthy of commendation. It is quite thorough and searching in its clear and exact examination and elucidation of the subject. Nor does Father Hurter fail to give satisfaction in that part of his book which is devoted to the exposition of the nature and foundation and claims of the Church. Here his work is strong.

Whilst the plan and general treatment of this part of his book are open to criticism and have undoubtedly evoked honest objection, and, to our mind, are inferior to the work of Mazella on the same subject, we must however bear testimony that the Rev. author has performed his task with far more than ordinary success. Upon the question of the Church's prerogatives, as well as of those which pertain to her Visible Head, he is clear and sound. The great truth of the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church he treats ably and learnedly. Of course upon this truth he throws no new light. The arguments he adduces are familiar to all students of theology. But in this there can be no reasonable ground for disappointment. In the treatment of this great and important subject by theologians of our day, what we look for is clearness of exposition and soundness of argument, and both of these we have in Father Hurter's treatise.

Incidentally in the treatment of the subject the Rev. author speaks of the timeliness of the Church's definition of the dogma. This has been from the beginning a vexed question. Great and good men have been on the one side, and great and good men on the other. Our author takes the ground that the time had come for the Church to speak out clearly and authoritatively on the subject. Whether the great minds of our age agree with him in this view of the question, matters not. At most it is now a mere problem or theory. For the Church's solemn declaration has practically ended the question. Our duty is plain.

The fourth and concluding part of the work before us the Rev. author devotes to the subject of faith. He treats it from a threefold aspect: First, from that of man believing; second, the relation between faith and knowledge; and third, the rule of faith in the concrete. To the exposition of these three our author devotes many pages. There is no denying that the subject of faith is a subtle one and demands of him who essays to enter deeply into it unusual ability. We feel sure that Father Hurter has performed his difficult task in a way that must be eminently satisfactory to students of theology. He is always clear, always safe. In doubtful issues he is always on the side of the great Doctors of the Church.

We can, therefore, safely commend Father Hurter's work. As a



text-book it may not be all we could desire, but the student of theology will ever find it a safe and trustworthy guide.

Sometimes we hear it said, and by those, too, who know whereof they speak, that devotion and practical morality are losing ground and are not near what they ought to be. May not this sad fact be attributable to the scant knowledge men have of God and their faith? Dogma is undoubtedly the source of devotion, and knowledge is love. What I do not know, I cannot love. Not knowing God as they should and having scarcely a faint notion, even, of the beauties of their faith, we cannot expect men to be other than they are. What they want is more dogma, more knowledge of God, a clearer insight into the beauties of their faith. With such works as Father Hurter's at command, our clergymen will be better equipped, and consequently better able to instruct our people. Hence the great good and high value of sound and trustworthy works on Dogmatic Theology.

---

GOD KNOWABLE AND KNOWN. By Rev. *Maurice Ronayne, S. J.*, Author of "Religion and Science." New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1888.

The purpose of this book is to furnish, to persons willing to think, arguments that bear on the existence and knowableness of God. The author frankly and modestly disclaims having either invented or discovered the arguments he presents. He says, and truly, that in their general outlines they have been before the human mind during all ages. But those arguments are just as available at present, in the warfare with infidelity, as in any period of the past, and they need only, as it were, to be refurbished anew, that they may be perfectly well fitted for modern use. To give the reasoning greater point and to answer various objections, the author has cast a great part of the arguments into the form of discussions. The places, times, and persons in these discussions have been feigned in order to give more vivid and practical reality to the arguments. The work is opportune as dealing with questions which, especially at this time, are earnestly debated. Its method, too, and arrangement of topics are highly judicious. The arguments are presented in a form that is free from all needless technicality, and the language in which they are expressed is as simple as the nature of the questions discussed will permit.

In pursuance of his plan the author very properly commences with showing that all nature witnesses to God. He shows from the very nature of matter itself—the fact that it is finite and contingent—that it requires, to account for its existence, the existence of an independent, absolute, self-existing, first cause. He then answers the various objections of those who assert that matter is uncreated, and proves that their different objections, almost without exception, involve the logical error of first assuming as undeniable the very point they are required to prove and then building upon it as though it had been conceded. He passes in review the ideas on this subject of Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Mill, Hamilton, Locke and Hume, tracing them back to ancient Greek and Roman sophists and exposing their fallacies.

The second chapter treats the very important subject, "The Data of Natural Knowledge." The third, fourth, and fifth chapters, respectively, have to do with "God our Creator," "The Vestiges of God in Creation," and "The Human Race bears Testimony to God." The fifth chapter, extending over fifty pages, is occupied with the subject of Buddhism, its history, leading ideas, and errors. We regard this chapter as one of the most timely, as well as one of the most satisfactory, in the whole work. Buddhism is a pretentious and subtle system, and some

of its most pernicious errors find congenial soil in the materialism and pessimism of our age.

The next six chapters are occupied respectively with the following subjects: "God in the Moral World," "The Nature of the Human Soul—Its Immortality," "Conscience as a Witness to God," "The Proofs of Conscience Confirmed," "The Knowledge of God Attainable by all Men," "St. Augustine's Soliloquy with God."

The work concludes with a valuable "Appendix," containing a refutation of Darwinism; an exposure of errors and fallacies in the article on "Theism" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica;" an account of the "Sacred Books of the East, and a Brief Treatise on the different Names of God."

The work, as we have said, is a timely one, and of permanent value. It will be especially of practical use to persons who are frequently brought into contact with infidels and skeptics; for it will furnish them with weapons ready for use to expose their errors and demolish their sophistical fallacies.

---

MISCELLANIES. By *Henry Edward*, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. III. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1888.

This volume is truly *multum in parvo*. Cardinal Manning is well known to be a concise as well as a lucid writer, well able to place his subject in strong light before his readers, without circumlocution and with few words. It would be difficult to find, among all our current literature, a book more replete with important historical facts and pregnant thoughts logically arranged and clearly set forth, than is the volume before us. The subjects, too, which it treats are subjects which, without exception, are vitally connected with burning questions of our own times, or have a direct bearing upon them.

All the papers, too, which the volume comprises, are taken from the writings of Cardinal Manning during the last few years, the earliest of them dating back only to 1880. They may be taken, therefore, as embodying the ripest experience and reflection, of one who has closely studied men and things, and living facts as well as books, for upwards of fifty years of adult manhood, and who has been himself *magna pars* of many important movements of his times.

Some of the papers treat subjects of universal importance; others discuss questions which, at first thought, judging them merely by their title, apply only to the social, political, or religious condition of England. But the subjects of this last-mentioned character are examined and treated in such broad and comprehensive manner, and on the basis of principles which are of such universal application, that they will be read, not only with interest, but with great profit, by citizens of all countries.

A number of these papers discuss profoundly (not profoundly in the sense of resorting to technical methods, but profoundly as going to the central root of the matter), and practically, the burning subject of education. They treat it from different sides, and set forth, with axiomatic clearness and force, the ideas and principles which ought to rule and govern this whole important subject in its bearings upon the rights and duties of children, the rights and duties of parents, the relations of children and of parents to society and civil government and to the Church, and the rights, duties, authority, and power of the State, on the one hand, and of the Church, on the other, to children and to parents, as regards education.

Another class of papers in the volume sets forth, under various titles, such as "Atheism and the Constitution of England," "Without God,



No Commonwealth," "Parliamentary Oaths," etc., and with reference to different practical applications of the same general truth, the relation of religion to human society and civil government. Others of these papers deal with important practical social subjects, such as "Our National Vice" (a lucid and powerful exposition of the evils of intemperance); "Pleading for the Worthless" "Out-door Relief," "The Law of Nature, Divine and Supreme" (an article published in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW on the right of the starving to bread), etc. Still other papers are on subjects of a more strictly ecclesiastical character, discussed broadly and in their general relations to human society, such as "The Salvation Army," "The Catholic Church and Modern Society," "The Soul Before and After Death," "The Church its Own Witness," etc.

It is scarcely necessary for us to add, after this statement of the contents of the volume, that it will not only interest and instruct intelligent readers, but will also serve as a valuable hand-book to speakers who wish to quickly furnish themselves with facts and thoughts upon the many important subjects which it treats.

---

THE LIFE OF ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. By *Father Genelli*, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German by M. Charles Sainte Foi, and rendered from the French by the Rev. Thomas Meyrick, S. J. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

It is indeed by a roundabout way that this book has reached us. But perhaps it has gained rather than lost merit in its circuitous course, for it is made to appear in very good English and a simple style that is far more easily adopted from the French than the German. But the strictest fidelity to originals, even of idiom, is observed in one particular—Father Genelli, M. Sainte Foi and Father Meyrick, in quoting the writings of St. Ignatius, adhere, as much as possible, not only to the sense, but as well to the construction and the mannerism of the phrase. M. Sainte Foi thus gives the reason for this course: "I have chosen to sacrifice the beauty of a free translation to the preservation of the original, so that the reader in perusing it may recognize, not only the meaning of the author, but his very spirit and way of expressing it. . . . I have done it not only out of respect for the great Saint whose life I here give, but for the love of truth and for the advantage of those readers who like to find in the words of great men, and of Saints especially, the peculiar stamp which distinguishes their character."

There were so many lives of the founder of the Society of Jesus already in the hands of the public that it may well be asked why this one has been added to the list, and that too at a time when he and his Society are in great disfavor in many countries. But Father Genelli had more than one very praiseworthy object in view. He had "a taste for that method of historical pursuit which by close observation of facts throw clearer light upon the character of times and persons." He had "observed that the lives of St. Ignatius hitherto published have kept rather to the surface of things, without endeavoring to trace out their connection or to dive into the motives which actuated this great man, or into the world of thought which was awakened in his soul." He had wanted to refute "the unfounded supposition made by those who pretended that the Society of Jesus is not what it was when St. Ignatius founded it." For these and other reasons he undertook to write this new life, in which he lets the Saint paint his own character by means of his letters and other writings. Father Genelli has fully availed himself of the recent progress made in historical research, and has produced a work that throws much light, not only on the subject of the biography,



but also on the age in which he lived. This book deserves to take the place of a standard biography.

CATHOLIC WORSHIP. The Sacraments, Ceremonies and Festivals of the Church explained in Questions and Answers. By *Rev. O. Gisler*. Translated from the German by Rev. Richard Brennan, LL.D. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

Besides the answers to the questions there are added almost on every page supplementary explanations that throw much additional light on the subjects discussed. Throughout the whole book the language is clear and simple. Everything about it goes to make this little volume eminently useful as a book of religious instruction in general, but more especially in the Sunday School, where every teacher should use it.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (Monthly). No. 1, January, 1889. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This is a periodical intended to discuss subjects relating to Theology, Canon law, and church discipline. It is edited by Reverend H. J. Heuser, of Philadelphia. Father Heuser is a Professor in the Theological Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and is well qualified for the important position to which he has been called.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE LIFE OF BLESSED MARTIN. De Porres (a negro Saint), of the Third Order of St. Dominic, in the Province of St. John Baptist, of Peru. Translated from the Italian by *Lady Herbert*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

SERMONS AT MASS. By the *Rev. Patrick O'Keefe, C. C.*, author of "Moral Discourses." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1888.

SELECTIONS FROM THE SERMONS OF PADRE AGOSTINO DA MONTEFALTRO. Edited by *Catharine Mary Phillimore*. London: The Church Printing Company.

FROM THE WORLD TO THE CLOISTER; OR, MY NARRATIVE. By *Bernard*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

LOURDES, ITS INHABITANTS, ITS PILGRIMS, AND ITS MIRACLES. With an Account of the Apparitions at the Grotto, and a Sketch of Bernadette's Subsequent History. By *Richard Clarke, S. J.* New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

AROER, THE STORY OF A VOCATION. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

LIFE OF LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON. From the French of Mrs. Augustus Craven. By *Henry James Coleridge, S. J.* London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1888.

SIX SERMONS ON DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART. By *Rev. Ewald Bierbaum, D.D.* Translated from the German by Miss Ella MacMahon. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS OF 1715. Compiled wholly from Original Documents. Edited by *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE, WITH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION. Arranged by the *Rev. Michael F. Glancey*, late of St. Mary's College, Oscott. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, limited. 1889.

LEAVES FROM ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Selected and Translated by *Mary H. Allies*. Edited, with a Preface, by T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. New York: Catholic Publication Society. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

LETTERS TO PERSONS IN RELIGION. With Introduction by *Bishop Hedley*, and Fac-Simile of the Saint's Handwriting. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

[70747]

PERIODICAL

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



